

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILD LIFE BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TRANSPORT LEGISLATION

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: State Cabinet, after receiving a report from me yesterday on matters associated with two Bills before the House, namely, the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill and the Motor Vehicles (Hours of Driving) Bill, agreed that Parliament would not be asked to pursue these Bills any further. This action has resulted from a meeting I attended at Mount Gambier on Saturday where I received submissions objecting to the legislation from about 100 transport industry representatives. The meeting voted overwhelmingly that I ask Cabinet to withdraw the two Bills in their entirety.

Mr. Venning: What about the United Farmers and Graziers?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That organization was more than delighted with the explanation I gave it in this building last Tuesday afternoon. Besides the objections raised at the Mount Gambier meeting, I have received numerous letters and telegrams from other parts of the State. The views of the transport industry had been sought prior to the drafting of the Bills, and general agreement had been reached on their contents. However, it is quite obvious now that the views expressed to me were not those of all of the people directly associated with the transport industry. The proposals

within the Bills provided for increased speed limits for commercial vehicles, restrictions on the hours of driving, the provision of regulation-making authority to restrict the weights carried by vehicles, and adequate braking systems for vehicles and trailers.

Generally, these provisions would have brought South Australian legislation into line with legislation now existing in the Eastern States. I visualized a lead time of about 12 months to allow the industry to prepare for the new legislation. I also agree to confer with the industry to protect its interests and those of other road users. Whilst I acknowledge that maximum speeds for commercial vehicles in South Australia are out-dated, it would be an act of irresponsibility to increase these maximum speed limits without, at the same time, controlling the weights of loads carried and ensuring that the braking systems were effective.

It is unfortunate that many operators had been panicked by incorrect information. Political intrusion also did little to assist with the carriage of the legislation. All sorts of oblique references were made by people who sought political capital, and as a result were successful in engendering into the minds of transport operators that their industry would be placed in jeopardy. The legislation would not have had this effect, nor would those transporters who operate in a responsible way have been adversely affected.

Another important aspect was that, prior to the introduction of the Bill, a committee on which both the South Australian Road Transport Association and the Automobile Chamber of Commerce were represented agreed on the speed limits, braking, and maximum axle loads. Honourable members will be aware that the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill also provided for wider powers designed to grapple with ever-increasing drinking driver problems. The Police Force would have been given additional powers requiring a suspect person to submit to either an alcotest or a breath analysis.

Provision was also made for the taking, by doctors, of a sample of a driver's blood if the driver attended a hospital. The Bill also established a new approach to the question of the installation and the payment of traffic control devices, and includes for the first time pedestrian and school crossings. However, I hope in the next session to reintroduce Bills to give effect to the provisions concerning traffic control devices and the drinking driver problem.

QUESTIONS

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Dr EASTICK: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport inform the House whether current studies involving public transport within South Australia include an in-depth study of a trolley bus system and, if such a system is being reviewed, will he say whether the use of more adaptable vehicles, such as those powered by liquid gas, is being considered? Members will be aware that the trolley bus system was a feature of public transport in South Australia for many years and that the last service involving trolley buses was phased out in 1963. We appreciate the need for a system that will help overcome pollution of the atmosphere and, while the use of trolley buses will overcome this difficulty, I suggest to the Minister that a system involving buses operated on liquid gas, or a similar system, would have the same effect. Such a system would also have the advantage of being more adaptable to the requirements of the community, and it would certainly be more in keeping with the type of transport the Minister has suggested in the past involving a dial-a-bus system.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The overall question of public transport is currently being reviewed. The trolley bus system is certainly one of the types of transport that have been considered, although regrettably, from my point of view, at this stage that system does not seem to have the economic advantage of other forms of transport. The low pressure gas system of operation has also been considered by the Government, and it will continue to be considered. It is not expected that a trolley bus system would in any way be related to the dial-a-bus system, because, of course, the principles of both systems are completely different.

EMPIRE TIMES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Attorney-General yet made up his mind about prosecutions arising from a certain issue of *Empire Times* and, if so, what has happened? I have asked the Attorney-General about this matter on eight occasions during the present session, the most recent of those occasions being on November 10 last year, when the Attorney-General said:

A report has been received from the police about what they have been able to ascertain from their inquiries. I have referred the matter to the Solicitor-General for his opinion on whether the information and evidence obtained is sufficient to support a prosecution.

As that was said three months ago, I believe that sufficient time has now elapsed for the Attorney-General to come to a conclusion. I hope that I will not have to ask again for information on this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This matter was referred to the Solicitor-General, as I have previously said. He advised me that the evidence was insufficient to establish against any specific person the commission of an offence. Therefore, the matter rests there.

ENFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WELLS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last Thursday about migration classes at the Enfield Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Following the honourable member's question and consideration of further representations from the school committee, the Education Department has recommended that, as accommodation was already provided for the migrant classes at Enfield Primary School, a case could be made out for the retention and resiting of the dual unit for this purpose. I was pleased to approve the recommendation and am pleased also to inform the honourable member that a dual room has been moved to the new site on the schoolgrounds.

ABATTOIRS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Premier say whether the Government will consider establishing a completely new export abattoir for the slaughtering of beef and sheep? In view of the current situation, which will obviously become critical if nothing is done, I understand that the Government has decided to allocate \$200,000 to provide for an extension to the beef slaughtering facilities at Gepps Cross. As I appreciate and applaud what is being planned, I do not want my reference to a new works to be in any way interpreted as a criticism of the project I have mentioned. The fact is that the industry is now hampered in that the export firms which have boning facilities at Gepps Cross could more than double their present output if there were facilities to slaughter more cattle. Possibly an additional 1,000 cattle a week could be boned by these firms. This situation causes some depression in prices, even though the industry is reasonably buoyant. Much slaughtering of cattle from this State is now done in Victoria. However, we cannot afford to have a limited kill in the Adelaide area, because people in Central Australia, the

northern areas of the State, and Eyre Peninsula depend on our having adequate slaughtering here. I have discussed the matter with knowledgeable and experienced people in the industry who ask why we should not now plan for a completely new abattoir for export killing or, perhaps, if we cannot have one large works for this killing, we could have a complex of smaller works in respect of which the Government could associate with private enterprise. As a similar policy has been followed by this Government and previous Governments in the past in respect of other industries, there would be nothing new in that procedure. Therefore, a new abattoir could be established, incorporating at the beginning the hygiene arrangements demanded by the American market. In the initial stages at least such ancillary work as the boiling down work, and so on, could be undertaken at the present facilities at Gepps Cross. There is plenty of land at Gepps Cross.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is tending to comment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In view of the adequate land available at Gepps Cross, it may be appropriate to establish this complex of works in that area. I can put the Premier in touch with people who are keen on this project and who would like to talk to him or to members of his Policy Secretariat about it. I ask him whether he will consider this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is difficult to give a succinct reply to the honourable member's question after that very full and detailed explanation. However, as it is true that the Government intends to move in this matter, I will get a full report for the honourable member.

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is correct that about 3,000 sheep were railed to Victoria for slaughtering, following the sale at the metropolitan abattoirs, Gepps Cross, last week? It is reported that buyers from other States purchased about 6,000 sheep last week, and that it was necessary for them to rail at least 3,000 sheep to Melbourne to be slaughtered. Most producers are pleased with the announcement that \$200,000 will be spent on a new beef hall at the abattoir, but I am told that a calf-slaughter chain is badly needed at this centre, as at present small calves have to be slaughtered on the mutton chain and big calves on the beef chain; this naturally causes delays in slaughtering. Additional sheep killing facilities

are needed, as well as an extension of the southern yards to accommodate more cattle.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a report from my colleague, and I will bring it down as soon as possible.

SEMAPHORE LAND

Mr. RYAN: On behalf of you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Works to obtain from the Minister of Lands a report on what the Lands Department intends to do with the vacant land situated on the corner of Semaphore Road and the Esplanade, Semaphore. Yesterday, you, Mr. Speaker, and I attended a meeting at Port Adelaide, during which we were asked to ascertain the intention of the Lands Department in respect of this land. The buildings that were previously on the land have been demolished and the site is now vacant.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week as to when plans would be ready for the Dartmouth dam and when tenders were likely to be called?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The present programme of works for the Dartmouth Dam is based on preliminary schedules prepared for the River Murray Commission by the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority. It is anticipated that preliminary site work will commence in early April. Design and detailed construction schedules will be undertaken immediately. It is expected that the first contracts for diversion works will be called to allow these parts of the project to be carried out in the 1972-73 summer. On the basis of the preliminary schedules, the main construction contract might be expected to be called during 1973.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. BURDON: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when the clean air regulations will be tabled?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The regulations are being drafted by the Crown Law Department and I expect that they will be ready for presentation in the foreseeable future. However, in view of the honourable member's question I will obtain an exact date and let the honourable member have a reply.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether the results of recent tests made by officers of the Public Health Department on fumes discharged from metropolitan brick works are now available and whether these tests have thrown further light on the possible means of controlling this problem? The problem of the effect of oil-fired kilns has previously been raised in this House on behalf of people living near the kilns. The effect of natural gas fire kilns on foliage, fruit trees and other plants is also well known. From discussions I have had with the manager of City Bricks Limited, I can say that it is apparent that these people are most anxious to help in whatever way they can. I understand that further tests, with new equipment, have recently been undertaken by the Public Health Department. I should be grateful if the Attorney could ascertain from his colleague the results of those tests.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

NORTH ADELAIDE ROADS

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question concerning the policy of his department in respect of the widening of arterial roads, particularly roads in the Walkerville area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Northcote Terrace will be widened to provide a 42ft. pavement, the maximum possible without removing the existing trees, during 1972-73. Main North Road, from Fitzroy Terrace to Nottage Terrace, and North-East Road, from Hampstead Road to Main North Road (via Nottage Terrace), will be widened to provide a 62ft. pavement, commencing in 1973.

EASTER TRAINS

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the South Australian Railways has plans for additional trains over the Easter holiday period to cater for public demand?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is a completely readjusted time table to meet public demands, but in particular I am pleased to be able to say that additional trains on March 31 and April 3, running to Victor Harbour, leaving Adelaide at 8.55 a.m. and returning from Victor Harbour at 5.20 p.m., will give people the opportunity of a pleasant day's outing. An additional train will run from Adelaide to Riverton to pick up sporting groups in the area and there will be a train to Tailm Bend leaving Adelaide at 10.20 a.m. on April 3.

FIRE PRECAUTIONS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the fire hazard that may be caused by school-children touring the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Education Department is not aware of any primary or secondary school excursion having taken place on the day on which the fire that the honourable member mentioned occurred. Although no specific instructions are issued regarding precautions, in regard to flammable materials, to be taken by students on educational excursions, heads of schools would ensure that they were so organized that every aspect of safety would be fully considered in the arrangements. If the honourable member gives me any additional information supporting the basis of his previous question, I shall be pleased to receive it.

NOARLUNGA MEATWORKS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health what technical solutions, if any, are available to control odours emanating from abattoirs, and will he also ask his colleague what regulations, if any, are available to force the proprietors of these enterprises to use these technical solutions? In this House I have previously spoken of the problem facing people in the area of Port Noarlunga, Port Noarlunga South, and Hackham because of rather unpleasant odours emanating from the Noarlunga meatworks. This problem is still far from being solved and is causing much concern to local people.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall refer the matter to the Minister of Health.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about salinity in the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The studies now in progress for salinity control measures along the Murray River necessitate the obtaining and collation of a considerable amount of field data to enable various alternative schemes to be developed to the stage where they can be assessed for (a) their effectiveness in mitigating the salinity problem, (b) cost-benefit relationships and (c) possible effects on environmental conditions. At this time, no project has advanced to the stage where detailed plans have been completed or the schemes progressed to the extent that it would be

possible to make a submission to the Commonwealth Government. I point out to the honourable member that I have made a preliminary approach to the Commonwealth Government, as I said last week in reply to the honourable member's earlier question, and that Government requires a detailed report. It is intended to seek Commonwealth assistance when the schemes have been developed to the point where they can be submitted for consideration under the national water resources development programme.

NICHOLSON AVENUE SCHOOL

Mr. BROWN: Will the Minister of Works have investigated the possibility of having the contractor who has contracted to rebitumenize the playground at the Nicholson Avenue Infants School, at Whyalla, return and finish the work or, alternatively, will the Minister have the work done by some other contractor? The contractor has dug up a large portion of the existing playground and has left it in this state, there being no guarantee as to when work on the project will be resumed. In the meantime, the children are playing on a surface that both the Headmistress and I consider dangerous.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I recall yesterday discharging a contractor from certain work, but I do not think that was the work to which the honourable member has referred. I will have an immediate investigation made and bring down a report as a matter of urgency.

MILLBROOK RESERVOIR POLLUTION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Works report to the House on the pollution of the Millbrook reservoir, caused by decaying fish? On Sunday a constituent telephoned me stating that a newspaper report understated the position and that, in his opinion, there were millions of rotting fish on the banks of the reservoir. This position had been brought about, according to the report, by the dosing of the reservoir with copper sulphate. It is also reported that there is no algae on the reservoir at present. So that I and other honourable members can be informed of the position, will the Minister give a report?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In anticipation of this question I have obtained a report, which states that, following the appearance of algae, in particular ceratium and volvox, in the waters of the Millbrook reservoir, chemical dosing with copper sulphate was carried out on Friday, March 17, 1972. A dose of less than

1 p.p.m. was applied and seven tons of copper sulphate was the total amount used to cover the water surface of the reservoir. (Note: normal chemical dosage rate is in the order of 1.0 to 1.5 p.p.m.). The application of copper sulphate is very effective and rapid in its action, to such an extent that within 24 hours small fingerling fish are killed and float to the surface. Continuous westerly and south-westerly winds on Friday and Saturday caused any floating materials, including the dead fish to accumulate along the waters edge of the eastern banks near Chain of Ponds and the public road around the reservoir. A departmental work force was employed to clear the dead fish on Sunday, March 19, 1972.

MODBURY TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on March 9 regarding the installation of traffic lights at the corner of North-East Road and Reservoir Road, Modbury?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Provided that there are no interruptions to the planned programme for the installation of traffic signals, it is expected that the traffic signals at the intersection of North-East Road and Reservoir Road, Modbury, will commence operation on or about April 12, 1972.

TOURISM

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of tourism, enlarge on a report in last weekend's *Sunday Mail* about tourism in South Australia? The report, which was written by William Reschke, was headed "\$10,000,000 a year plan for South Australia tour route", and it states:

A hush-hush \$1,000,000 plan to restore old Robe as a model seaport to attract 10,000,000 tourist dollars a year to South Australia is being studied by the Government The Premier (Mr. Dunstan), who is handling the plan as part of a grand tourism design for the State, will visit Swan Hill on April 8 and 9. The next paragraph is the one in which I am particularly interested. It states:

Two other sites, Burra and Morgan, have been considered for a Swan Hill type tourist attraction.

Members who visited Victoria with the Parliamentary bowls team were taken to the Sovereign Hill complex, at Ballarat, and I think all agree that this is an excellent project. I know that the Morgan council has asked the Government to do something about tourism in the Morgan area, because the Government's decision to remove the dockyard from Morgan has left that township without any industry.

The council considers that the establishment of a tourist industry in this area would help the town to overcome its difficulties. Also, Burra, which is one of the oldest mining towns in Australia, is in an excellent situation for a project of this kind, particularly with the new mine operating.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The various groups referred to in the newspaper report have approached me, and they are to make further submissions to the Government in due course. Until we get those submissions, I cannot give the House any further information.

EFFLUENT RESEARCH

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last Thursday about research on the effect of effluent on the ecology in St. Vincent Gulf?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As announced earlier this year, a marine study of littoral waters from north of Port Gawler south to Sellick Beach to observe changes in marine ecology has commenced. Observations and routine analysis will be made of certain pollution parameters over the next three years. Approximate total costs for this programme of works are as follows:

| Item | Approximate cost \$ |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Staff | 15,000 |
| Operating costs | 20,000 |
| Plant and equipment | 15,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | <u>\$50,000</u> |

BRIGHTON MEMORIAL ARCH

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to a question I asked last Wednesday about expediting work on cleaning the Arch of Remembrance near the Brighton jetty?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A contract was let for the repair of the Arch of Remembrance at Brighton, but the necessary materials required to apply a new "gemstone" finish, the same as the original, had to be ordered by the contractor from the United Kingdom. The contractor states that the materials are now to hand, and that he expects the work will be commenced within the next two or three weeks.

TROUBRIDGE BERTH

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked on March 14 about wharf facilities for fishing boats, now that the *Troubridge* will resume the Port Lincoln run?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When the new deep berths for bulk grain and phosphate rock ships are completed, berths 2 and 3 (either side of Brennan jetty), comprising about 1,200ft. of berthing space, would be generally unused. Therefore, it is intended that those berths be used by fishing vessels, and it is considered that this should provide all the additional accommodation that the fishing industry will require at Port Lincoln for many years ahead.

ABORTION

Mr. GUNN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked last Thursday about the report of the committee studying the abortion laws of this State?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The report of the Advisory Committee on Abortion will be laid before both Houses of Parliament today, and will be available for perusal by interested members.

ROSE PARK SCHOOL

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Education say what action may be taken to expedite the replacement of the cassette tape recorder and the sum of money stolen recently from the Rose Park Primary School? Under the terms of an arrangement made with the department, I understand that the tape recorder will, in fact, be replaced if it cannot be recovered and that a sum of money up to \$20 will also be replaced. However, a sum of money over and above the \$20 had been deposited in the safe before school closed for the day, this money having been paid in as excursion money. I understand that \$42 has been stolen, and this is of concern to the parents and friends association, as also is the fact that lack of a cassette tape recorder is seriously holding up development of the school library and preventing the making of school recordings, etc. Although I understand that the cassette recorder will be replaced in due course, the trouble is that "due course" may be a little too long, and I should like to know whether something can be done to expedite the replacement of these things.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In these matters where replacement is necessary, certain delays are involved because of the necessity to obtain police reports on what has transpired and because of the numerous technical arrangements and checks that are also necessary. I will look into the matter raised by the honourable member concerning the Rose Park Primary School, see what is being done, and let him have a reply as soon as possible.

RENMARK PUMPING STATION

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works say how many possible sites were examined prior to the decision made to locate the proposed houseboat sewage pumping station in the Jarrett Memorial Gardens in Renmark? The decision to use this site was recently announced by the Renmark council and has caused considerable comment by people in the area, especially members of the Anglican congregation in Renmark, as the pumping station will be close to the church.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I do not know exactly how many alternative sites were inspected by the department before it was finally decided to locate a pumping station on this site, I am aware of the comment that the decision has caused. Although I have no doubt that several sites were examined, I will obtain this information for the honourable member. I believe the present site was recommended because of its suitability from the point of view of manoeuvring craft, etc. The pumping station would fit in with the general surrounds quite well; in fact, every effort would be made to ensure this, and pipes would be placed underground. I believe that the furore that has resulted is largely based on incorrect information being given. I do not want to upset in any way the Anglican community in Renmark: in fact, I want to help the people concerned. If another site can be found which is suitable and which involves no great difficulties, I shall be happy to have that site examined. However, before locating the station elsewhere, I should want to satisfy myself that there is justification for objecting to the present proposed location.

WHEELCHAIRS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport now make a clear statement of the intention of the Government on legislation concerning wheelchairs? Last Thursday, I asked the Minister two questions about such legislation. The first question concerned the use of footpaths by motorized wheelchairs, which is not currently permissible because wheelchairs are required to travel on the carriageway. The second question concerned the licensing of persons under the age of 16 years who must use these vehicles as a result of a physical disability. The Minister answered the first question to the effect that the Government intended to introduce legislation on that matter. I was pleased about that but, when I asked the second question, the Minister first objected that I had already asked

the question and he then confessed that, when he answered that question, he thought I was asking the second question. Therefore, the position was entirely confused. However, the *Advertiser* on Friday printed my first question and the Minister's reply to it, so that the impression now is that the Government intends to legislate to allow motorized wheelchairs to run on the footpath. As this confusion has occurred, I ask the Minister to now make a statement.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not studied either the questions or the answers to which the honourable member has referred. I did give him a reply to one of his confused questions relating to the plea he made on behalf of a 13-year-old girl who could not use a motorized wheelchair because of the restrictive nature of the Act. I indicated that the Government had agreed to amending the legislation to provide accordingly. However, I will study the questions raised by the honourable member and see what information is available.

Mr. Millhouse: I hope you don't take too long.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It won't take half as long as it took you to give us replies when you were in office.

The SPEAKER. Order! The honourable member for Tea Tree Gully.

REDWOOD PARK SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain information concerning the exact location, date of purchase, and the cost of land acquired by the Education Department for the erection of a new primary school to be known as the Redwood Park Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain the information.

STUDENTSHIPS

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week concerning studentships and scholarships granted by the Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Chairman of the Public Service Board reports that three main factors influence the number of tertiary studentships awarded from time to time by the Public Service Board on behalf of the Government. They are as follows: (1) the expected demand for the employment of such persons in the Public Service at the time they should complete their tertiary studies; (2) the extent to which persons with such qualifications are likely to be available from other sources;

and (3) the availability of funds to pay the cost of the studentships and the salaries on subsequent appointment.

It should be recognized that Public Service studentships were not introduced as, and were never intended to be, a subsidy to the education system. They were introduced so that the Government, as employer, would be assured of professionally trained personnel to maintain the functions of Government. When alternative sources of recruitment exist, the justification for Public Service studentships ceases. The reason, therefore, for the decline in the number of studentships this year is an expectation that the foreseeable demand for staff in the years immediately ahead can be met from persons coming out of tertiary training institutions without the awarding of Public Service studentships to the same extent as hitherto. If more studentships are considered justified so that more people can enter upon tertiary training, that is a matter relating to the education system rather than a matter for the Government as an employer. It is pointed out that in recent years the granting of Public Service studentships has seldom meant any additional students undertaking the courses because of the imposition of quotas on most courses in the tertiary institutions. The award of studentships resulted in the students being bonded to serve the Government for a specified period on completion of the course.

Thus the number of Public Service Board studentships has been decreased this year because of the reduction in the need for the granting of such studentships. The increase in the number of teaching scholarships does not constitute an anomaly because, with relatively few exceptions, appointment to the teaching service is solely by this method. During the past two years, the Government has considerably liberalized the facilities for part-time study by public servants on tertiary courses. In the current financial year a sum of approximately \$83,000 will be paid to about 1,600 Government employees as reimbursement of fees for study undertaken relevant to their employment. This was the reason for discontinuing the Public Service Board scholarships referred to on schedule 2. They cease to have any significance following the introduction of the fees reimbursement scheme.

FREIGHT CONCESSION

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider extending the current freight concession to cover stock leaving the

Gepps Cross abattoir sale yards? Stock currently coming into the sale yards on two or more rail trucks is subject to a 20 per cent concession, and I ask that that concession be extended to stock leaving the Gepps Cross abattoir. Much help has been given the abattoir by Victorian buyers who come to South Australia and purchase surplus stock being offered here. Had it not been for such buyers yesterday, I believe the prices obtained for stock would have been much lower. I therefore ask the Minister to consider these people who, by their action, are helping the primary producers of this State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are always happy to consider people, especially primary producers.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the interest that has been shown in the current Festival of Arts and the progress that has been made on the festival hall at the rear of Parliament House, will the Minister of Works say what progress has been made on the new Government Printing Office at Netley and will he ascertain the scheduled date of completion of that project? Will he also ascertain when it is expected that the present printing building, conditions in which are detrimental to the efficiency of the department and to the health of people working in it, will be demolished?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be aware that work is currently proceeding on a new Government Printing Office at Netley. I am not certain of the scheduled date of completion, but I think it is late 1973. I will, however, obtain a report. Following the occupation of the new building, the old Government Printing Office will be demolished to allow the plaza associated with the theatre complex to be developed.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the South-Eastern Freeway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The section of pavement which failed near the Raywood cut was not complete inasmuch as the final 1 in. thick layer of $\frac{1}{2}$ in. asphaltic concrete still had to be laid. This is normally done shortly before each section is opened to traffic. The failure was due to an unforeseen and unusual intrusion of water into the lower pavement and adjacent subgrade that occurred during last year's very wet winter. The reasons for this

intrusion, and its effect on the pavement structure, have proved to be highly complex. However they are now fully understood, and steps are being taken to carry out repairs and to ensure that there will be no recurrence of the problem. Reconstruction of this section is still under way, and final costs are not yet available. However, fairly extensive reconstruction is necessary to ensure that all suspect material is removed and thus attain a relatively maintenance-free road surface, and costs are expected to be about \$20,000.

Later:

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my recent question concerning the South-Eastern Freeway?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Hills Freeway proposed in the metropolitan transportation study was not adopted in the supplementary plan to the 1962 development plan. Traffic using the South-Eastern Freeway destined for the city and the metropolitan area will make use of the arterial road network. The arterial roads are being progressively widened and intersection improvements are being effected in step with the increasing traffic volumes.

FOUNDRY

Mr. RYAN: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Engineering and Water Supply Department future plans with regard to the demolition of the old foundry at Glanville? Yesterday afternoon, the Minister opened probably the most modern foundry in South Australia, operations from Glanville having been transferred there. The foundry at Glanville is one of the oldest buildings the Government owns, and that building is probably in a worse state of repair than any other building the Government owns. I should like to know whether that building will be demolished and, if it will be, what use will be made of the land.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What the honourable member has said cannot be refuted. The old foundry operated for almost 100 years; in fact, it was decided to build the new foundry because, had people continued to work in the old foundry, they would have risked injury, as that building was in danger of collapsing. I do not think anyone would desire to retain this building as a notable work of architecture; I think that people who have seen it will agree with the member for Price that it needs to be demolished. I even wonder whether,

if we hold on a little longer, it might demolish itself. I will seek the information for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as possible.

NORTH ESPLANADE

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether tenders have been let for work on North Esplanade, Glenelg North, and if they have been, what is the sum of the successful tender, what work will be undertaken, and how long it will take to complete? Some of my constituents are concerned that work has commenced on restoring North Esplanade. Sand is being deposited there in such a way that yesterday it blew across the road into the houses.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will bring down the information as soon as I can.

PORT LINCOLN SILO

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on March 1 about the Port Lincoln silo?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Railways Commissioner directed that the count be made at the Port Lincoln silo. This procedure is not uncommon and has been applied to road and airline passengers, interstate road hauliers, etc. It is in the nature of market research. In respect, however, of the grain deliveries to the Port Lincoln terminal, the Railways Commissioner was very disturbed at the fact that during the harvest period train crews on Eyre Peninsula were working short time, whereas in normal years it had been necessary to augment the staff by seconding men from the Adelaide Division.

Mr. Gunn: You say—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should like to reply to the member for Flinders without interjections from the member for way out farther, who is not interested in the reply. Indicative of the poor level of rail traffic offering was the fact that over the three weeks' from December 26, 1971, to January 5, 1972, only 3,379 tons of wheat and barley was received at Port Lincoln by rail. This represents not more than five train-loads over the three-week period. As it was obvious that certain growers were bypassing their local silos and road carting direct to Port Lincoln, the Commissioner sought to ascertain in which areas this was happening with a view to reporting to me on the present situation, and as a follow up to his comments on the general rail situation to which I referred in the House on March 2, 1972.

SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about service stations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not the policy of the Minister of Lands, where it is within his power, to permit Crown lands, and lands held under licence lease or agreement to purchase now occupied or leased for agricultural or pastoral purposes, to be transferred and/or subdivided for the purpose of providing service stations, except in special circumstances, west of Penong.

MISCELLANEOUS LEASES

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to state the terms and conditions offered to holders of miscellaneous leases, which are due for renewal, in the Loveday area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

CIGARETTES

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health what was the decision, on placing warning labels on cigarette packets, at the Health Ministers' conference held in Queensland on March 3? I have been fortunate enough to have had passed a private member's Bill requiring warning labels to be placed on cigarette packets, and the Government agreed to do this when the majority of States agreed to do the same thing. I understand that most of the States have now adopted this policy.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Health.

FIRE-FIGHTING VEHICLES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of February 29 concerning third party insurance on fire-fighting vehicles?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The scale of premiums for third party insurance has not changed with the introduction of the new system of payment for insurance with registration to the Motor Vehicles Department. The premiums payable for fire-fighting vehicles in country areas as fixed by the Insurance Premiums Committee are \$5 for fire brigade vehicles and \$10 for other fire-fighting vehicles. Contrary to the inference contained in the letter to the honourable member, these differential rates have been payable both before and after January 1, 1972, when the new insurance

registration system commenced. If the organization referred to by the honourable member has been paying a lesser premium than those specified, it has been undercharged and the insurance company concerned has dishonoured its obligations as an approved insurer. The fact of the matter is that payment of the correct premiums must now be made. These premiums are based on statistics compiled by the premiums committee over many years and reflect claims experienced in the categories concerned.

POINT McLEAY RESERVE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs obtain a report from the Superintendent of the Point McLeay Reserve on whether or not the parents of children presently attending school at Meningie who travel from Point McLeay to Meningie each day are happy that children above grade 3 are obliged to do this? Secondly, will he also ask these parents to consider the uniting of their school with the Narrung Primary School? I understand that at present the primary school at Point McLeay teaches children in grades 1, 2 and 3, that for classes beyond that the children must travel a long distance by bus to school, and that the parents of those children are unhappy about the distance those children have to travel. There is a problem concerning numbers at the Narrung Primary School and I understand that the parents of children at that school would welcome an increase in the number of children attending there. Of course, before I can make representations to the Minister of Education on this matter, it will be necessary to know whether the parents of children at Point McLeay are in agreement with the uniting of the two schools. I would therefore appreciate the Minister's ascertaining whether the parents at Point McLeay would agree to such an alteration.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall be pleased to do so.

BUSES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain for me the weights of the four main types of bus used by the Municipal Tramways Trust? I should like to know the unladen weight (front and rear axles) and the laden weight (front and rear axles). I am told that at times the buses carry more passengers than there is seating for and I should like to know as accurately as possible what is the maximum weight they

carry on their front and rear axles. I ask the question because I believe it to be of interest to people using road transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will examine the question and bring down a reply.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my recent question concerning the details required of applicants for fishing licences?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation has designed a simple application form for renewal of fishing licences and related permits. The more comprehensive application form being used this year will be retained, but will be used only for the first or original application, when a considerable amount of information is necessary to determine the applicant's eligibility for a certain class of licence or permit. I have with me a renewal application form which may be of interest to the honourable member, and which I would be pleased to show him.

STORMWATER OUTLETS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation refer to his department the problem caused to seaside dwellers by stormwater outlets along the beach front? After heavy rains there are often large residual pools of water into which seaweed is washed. When the seaweed decomposes, it produces hydro-carbon gases, some of which cause smells that are unpleasant to people living nearby.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to examine the matter raised by the honourable member.

COURT COMPLEX

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What action does the Attorney-General intend to take regarding the block of land, which is owned by the Commonwealth Government, at the corner of Wright Street and King William Street? The Attorney-General knows that this block of land was purchased by the Commonwealth Government for the erection of Commonwealth courts and also, I think, accommodation for the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department. The announcement of its purchase was first made during the time the Premier was in office as Attorney-General and I made public comment on it when I was in office. I have certainly raised the matter with the Attorney-

General since he has been in office. However, nothing has been done and the site is a disgrace. I have made representations directly to some Commonwealth members and the present Attorney-General. I ask the question because it will be a great shame if the site is allowed to remain indefinitely in its present condition. I wonder whether he has heard anything from the Commonwealth Government about the matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think that on a previous occasion, in a reply to a question, probably asked by the member for Mitcham, I said that I had learnt, quite by chance as a result of a communication from the Commonwealth Attorney-General through a member of the House of Representatives who represents a district in this State, that the Commonwealth Government might no longer need this site, doubtless because of a change of plans regarding the establishment of a new court of intermediate jurisdiction. I thereupon wrote to the Commonwealth Attorney-General, pointing out that the site had been transferred to the Commonwealth Government for the specific purpose of being used for a Commonwealth court but that it now seemed that it might not be any longer needed by the Commonwealth Government. I pointed out that, if it was not so needed, this State would wish to re-acquire it, because it was so much a part and parcel of the court complex. I have not the correspondence in front of me but the general effect of the Attorney-General's reply was that no decision had been made whether the Commonwealth Government needed the site. I have since communicated with the Attorney-General and I have spoken to the present Attorney-General for the Commonwealth about the matter, but I have not been able to obtain any more definite information. The matter rests there at the moment. I hope that the Commonwealth Government soon decides whether it will relinquish ownership of this site, so that the State can acquire it and reserve it as part of the court complex. However, I do not see that anything further can be done at present other than await a decision from the Commonwealth Government.

GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say whether the contract for the groundworks for the new Gladstone High School will be let in the few days of March that remain? I apologize to the Minister for having to raise this matter so often, but I raise it hoping that

the plan that was outlined may still prevail. Information has been received that tenders for the groundworks would be called in March and that the work would be completed by the end of November and be ready for the commencement of the 1973 school year. The Minister will be well aware that this work is exactly 12 months behind the schedule that he outlined more than 12 months ago. However, we accept all that, for various reasons, but the latest information was that the tenders for the groundworks would be called in March. Only a few days are left in March, and the people of Gladstone are concerned that the programme may drop back a little further.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do wish that, when the honourable member indulges in a review of history, he would go a little further back on each occasion and that he would also say that Sir Thomas Playford first promised the people of Gladstone a new high school in 1938. It has finally taken a Labor Government to look after the effective interests of the people of this town.

Mr. Venning: Answer my question, please.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I assure the honourable member that I will reply to his question. I think the information that I gave the honourable member previously was that tenders for site works would be called for in the latter half of March. As the Ides of March have already passed, with assassinations taking place, I shall be pleased to inquire and find out the present position for the honourable member, but I assure him that we are determined that the work should be finished by the end of this year so that it will be available at the beginning of 1973.

POLICE STATION CLOSURES

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary how many police stations in the whole of the country area are being closed and what routine police protection the people living in small country towns will receive in future? A constituent who has a sister residing in a small town near Clare has told me that several police stations in the Mid-North are being closed.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will ask the Chief Secretary to look into the matter, particularly the circumstances of the suburb of Clare to which the honourable member has referred.

HORSE TRACKS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether there are any plans to provide bridle paths or horse

tracks in national parks in or near the metropolitan area for the benefit of those who engage in horse riding? I think most members have been impressed by the proposal about the use of Heysen Trail for bush walking. Many people in the community have expressed the desire for similar facilities for riding horses, and it seems that there is a demand for this. I should be grateful if the Minister would consider the matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: For some months this matter has been the subject of discussions with the national parks authorities and people interested in horse riding. I understand that recently arrangements have been concluded for giving these people some area of the National Park at Belair for horse riding, but I will make sure by getting an accurate report for the honourable member.

OAKLANDS CROSSING

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what is the present stage of planning for the Oaklands crossing, where Diagonal Road and Morphett Road cross the railway line? Has a plan been adopted and, if it has, will that plan be made available?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As far as I am aware, no plan has been adopted yet.

STRZELECKI TRACK

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the Strzelecki Creek track?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department is undertaking a continuous programme of maintenance and upgrading works on the Strzelecki track so that it is kept in a reasonable condition commensurate with the volume of traffic using it. However, no major improvement can be carried out because, despite the increasing importance of the road, traffic volumes are still relatively light, and there are many miles of roads elsewhere in the State where heavier traffic volumes are carried and where there is a prior warrant for significant improvement.

CEDUNA STOCK INSPECTOR

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a report on why the stock inspector at Ceduna has been shifted and has not been replaced?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

BOTANIC GARDEN

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands, under whose administration I understand the Botanic

Garden comes, to investigate the reason why the notice board inside the Botanic Garden gate has not been updated, as the regulations printed on the board are dated 1949? Teenage constituents from my district visited the Botanic Garden recently and they were asked to leave the garden because they had a portable tape recorder with them. It seems that, under the regulations, a person is not permitted to play any instrument within the Botanic Garden grounds, and this includes a transistor radio. As the regulations were changed on March 19, 1970, I should be grateful if the Minister would ask his colleague to find out why the notice on the board has not been updated.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it the honourable member has studied these regulations and found that there has been no amendment since 1949.

Mr. Becker: They were changed in 1970, but the notice board has not been changed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Bearing in mind that the notice board has not been changed, these people were apparently asked to leave the grounds because, despite the change in the regulations, apparently the attendant did not know that the regulations had been changed. It seems that we not only need to change the information on the notice board but we need to educate the staff as well. I shall have the Minister of Lands examine the matter to see whether the information on the board cannot be altered so that this serious matter does not occur again in future.

CATTLE TESTING

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to investigate the relationship between contracts issued for the tuberculosis testing of cattle and the actual number of cattle in this State, with a view to ensuring that a total coverage is provided? Contracts thus issued for the whole of South Australia total between 85,000 and 90,000, compared to an approximate total of 720,000 beef cattle. This does not take into account dairy cattle covered by the same contracts. It will be seen, therefore, that many cattle can never be tested. However, as tuberculosis could be eradicated if mass testing were undertaken over a period of a few years, I ask the Minister to consider providing sufficient funds for this purpose.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Agriculture.

TRAFFIC OFFENCES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General consider the possibility of having all traffic offence charges heard in one court? I have been approached by a constituent who informed me that, on appearing on what he called a minor traffic offence, he was forced to wait through a list involving other police offences, and he understood that traffic offence cases were heard in conjunction with cases involving other offences not relating to traffic. He suggests that it might be better and that the hearing of traffic offences might be expedited if they were heard in one of the six police courts.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The desirability of cases involving traffic offences being heard in a special court has been widely discussed throughout Australia, and such a system has been operating in Sydney for some years. There is a body of opinion, including that of certainly at least one leading Australian criminologist, that this is undesirable because it tends to inculcate in the minds of traffic offenders the suggestion that what they have done is not really a breach of the law in the ordinary sense but one of those minor peccadilloes that respectable citizens commit from time to time. I think we must stress that a breach of traffic laws is a serious matter, exposing other citizens to risk of loss of limb and even of life.

I am not at all convinced that it would promote observance of the traffic laws and road safety to treat traffic offences differently from other offences. I know that certain organizations favour having traffic cases heard in separate courts, but at this stage I merely make the point that the thinking on this matter is not by any means all one way and that there are cogent considerations against having a separate traffic court. I have no immediate plans to try to arrange the courts in this way and certainly, in view of the doubts (to say the least) that have been raised concerning the desirability of the practice, I should want the opinions of people concerned with the matter to crystallize much more before moving in this direction.

STATE FINANCES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say whether State finances are proceeding according to the Budget? I notice that the statement on Consolidated Revenue shows that there was an excess of receipts over payments of \$4,239,000 for February, 1972, and that the excess of receipts over payments for the

eight months ended February, 1972, amounted to \$1,815,000. In view of the current financial position, I am wondering whether State finances are proceeding according to the Budget.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is expected that the Budget result this year will be somewhat more favourable than that originally forecast in the Budget, this result having occurred through several factors. However, the budgetary outlook for all States for the next financial year is not a happy one, given what one can forecast of increases in costs during the period. We are having to move cautiously at present until we know what the Commonwealth Government is willing to do next June. However, I expect that the final result of the Budget this year will be a lower deficit than that for which I originally budgeted.

SANCTUARIES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (on notice):

1. How many sanctuaries on private land have been established pursuant to section 26 (b) of the Fauna Conservation Act?
2. Approximately what area is covered by sanctuaries so established?
3. How many revocations have been proclaimed pursuant to section 27 (i) of the Act?
4. Approximately what area is covered by these revocations?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. 134 sanctuaries have been proclaimed pursuant to section 24 of the Fauna Conservation Act where prior consents have been obtained under section 26 (b) of the Fauna Conservation Act.
2. The approximate area of sanctuaries so established is 1,335,514 acres.
3. Only one fauna sanctuary has been revoked pursuant to section 27 (i) of the Act. The sanctuary in question covered the Loxton recreation reserve which was revoked by request when the council established a caravan park on the area.
4. The area covered by such revocations is 150 acres.

WATER PUMPING

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What progress has been made on the installation of water meters to measure water pumped from the Murray River for irrigation purposes?
2. When is it expected that this programme will be completed?

3. What expenditure has been incurred to date on such installations?

4. What is the expected total cost of the scheme?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. 236 meters have been installed to date, representing 25 per cent of the total.
2. December, 1973.
3. \$138,000.
4. \$470,000.

DRUG ADDICTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What facilities are available in South Australia for the treatment of drug addicts?
2. Are these facilities considered sufficient?
3. If not, what plans are there for increasing them?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Drug addicts may be treated on an inpatient basis at the Hillcrest, Enfield, Glenside and St. Anthony's Hospitals.

(b) They may be treated on an outpatient basis at the Hillcrest, Enfield and Glenside Hospitals, the Community Mental Health Centre, Parkside, the Community Mental Health Centre, Woodville, the St. Corantyn Day Hospital, East Terrace, Adelaide, and the Elura Clinic, 74 Hill Street, North Adelaide.

2. and 3. The facilities of the Mental Health Services are considered to be adequate at present, but those of the Alcoholic and Drug Addicts Treatment Board are insufficient to meet present needs, and tenders are now being called for the construction of a night hospital of 10 beds at St. Anthony's Hospital; and planning has been approved, and is under way, for the construction of a 40-bed voluntary centre at Folland Avenue, Northfield.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What has been the cost, so far, of the establishment of the State Government Insurance Office?
2. What is the total of its revenue to date?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. \$115,000.
2. \$400,000.

SOLICITOR-GENERAL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 1, lines 14 and 15 (clause 4)—Leave out "practitioner of the Supreme Court" and insert "legal practitioner".

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The reason given by the Legislative Council for this amendment is that it may be desired by a future Government to appoint to the office of Solicitor-General a legal practitioner who has not been a practitioner of the South Australian Supreme Court for the requisite period of seven years. I cannot imagine a Government desiring to take such a course and I do not regard the amendment as a necessary amendment, but certain members (a majority in the Legislative Council) desired that this amendment be incorporated in the Bill.

Motion carried.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(GENERAL)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The present Licensing Act has been in operation for over four years. We have now had time to assess the impact of the innovations that it introduced into the laws governing the sale and consumption of liquor. The Act has in fact generally worked very well. The adverse social consequences that some feared would result from the introduction of extended trading hours have not materialized. In general, a more civilized pattern of drinking has emerged. However, continuing experience with the Act has disclosed certain areas in which its operation may be improved and in which further relaxation of the restrictions upon drinking may be made without adverse consequences. The present Bill is designed to make improvements in these areas. The Bill lays a good deal of emphasis upon the promotion of tourism. In this connection it provides that the Minister of Tourism may declare any premises or proposed premises to be a prescribed tourist hotel. Such a declaration is to be made only where the

service to be provided will be of exceptionally high standard and will have a material effect upon the tourist industry. Where such a declaration is made the hotel is not subject to the objections that may, in the normal course, be made to the grant of a full publican's licence and the court may authorize the licensee to sell liquor up to 3 a.m. in the morning. It should be noted that objections may still be made to the grant of a licence in respect of such premises by the Superintendent of Licensed Premises. The Bill makes an amendment to section 15 of the principal Act, which deals with the grant of licences in national parks and national pleasure resorts. At present the lessee of the chalet in the Wilpena National Pleasure Resort holds a limited publican's licence. There is a substantial demand from campers in the area for liquor. This demand cannot be properly met because of the restricted nature of the licence. It is felt that the special circumstances require a special kind of licence and accordingly the Bill permits the court to grant a licence and "tailor" the provisions to the requirements of the area.

The Bill also provides that special licences may be granted to the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner and to authorities engaging in construction works so that the needs of the workers engaged in areas in which liquor cannot be readily obtained from licensed outlets can be adequately supplied. The Bill also provides for a special licence to permit the sale of liquor at the Cornish Festival. The committee promoting this festival has decided to proceed with the festival over the Labor Day weekend. The major activities will be at Kadina on Sunday, October 8, 1972. It is hoped that this festival may become an annual event. The licence will be similar in nature to that which is issued to the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival Committee. The Bill extends the hours during which liquor may be served in hotel dining rooms and in restaurants to 1.30 a.m. Corresponding amendments have been made also in respect of dining rooms in motels and premises to which a wine licence applies. These changes result from recommendations made by the South Australian Restaurant Association. The Bill reduces to 2 l the minimum quantity of wine or brandy that may be sold on any one occasion by the holder of a vigneron's licence.

The Bill makes significant amendments to the provisions of the principal Act relating to clubs. Many licensed clubs do not require the full licensing hours stipulated by the principal Act. The Bill empowers the court

to modify these trading hours to suit the requirements of the particular club. It empowers the court to tailor a club's trading hours to the needs of the members of the particular club. Important changes are also made in the provisions relating to club permits. A permit may under the provisions of the new Act be granted to any club that has been in existence for 12 months. At present only those clubs that were in existence at the commencement of the principal Act are entitled to permits. Some clubs have used permits to engage in trading that is far more extensive than is regarded as appropriate for this kind of authority. The Bill accordingly provides that a club permit shall not authorize the sale of liquor over more than 39 hours a week. Where the annual sales of liquor realize more than \$15,000, the club must change to a club licence. In such cases the club will seek a club licence. Finally, the Bill enables a visitor who has been properly introduced to a club by a member to pay for drinks bought in the presence of the member. The existing restriction has proved to be impossible of enforcement.

The Bill introduces an important principle into the provisions of the principal Act relating to restaurant licences. Many small restaurants are run by the members of a single family. Where this is the case, it is fair that the restaurateur and his family should have one day's respite in each week from the obligation to keep the restaurant open. Accordingly the Bill provides that the court shall, upon the application of a restaurateur, permit him to close the restaurant on one day in each week. The day is to be specified by the court, and the court may require as a condition of the exemption that notice be given to avoid public confusion and inconvenience. The provisions relating to theatre licences which at present only apply to theatres in which "live" entertainments are performed have been extended by the Bill. In future licences may be given in respect of cinemas where appropriate facilities for the sale and consumption of liquor exist. The Bill enables a publican who has been invited by the organizers of an entertainment to operate a booth permit to pay over a proportion of his receipts to the organizers. At present the organizers charge the publican a fee but it cannot be related to the proceeds of the liquor sold. It is felt that the organizers of functions for which a publican operates a booth permit should in appropriate cases be entitled to charge a fee based upon the receipts from the sale of the liquor.

The Bill enables the court to grant, to the holder of a full publican's licence, a limited publican's licence or a restaurant licence, a permit entitling the licensee to sell and supply liquor for consumption in outdoors areas defined by the court. Under this provision, the boulevard restaurant that has been such a success in this year's Festival of Arts may become a feature of the South Australian way of life. The Bill deals with many other procedural and administrative matters which I shall explain in proceeding through the clauses of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 of the Bill are formal. Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act. The definition of "liquor" is amended by striking out the present phrase stipulating the level of alcohol that is required if a liquid is to constitute "liquor" for the purposes of the Act. The old provisions relating to "proof spirit" do not accord with modern analytical methods, and the amendment accordingly provides that a liquid constitutes "liquor" if it contains more than 1.15 per cent alcohol by volume at 20° Celsius. The definitions are also amended to deal with the appointment of an Assistant Superintendent of Licensed Premises and to make provision for metric conversion.

Clause 5 strikes out subsections that have now exhausted their original purpose. Clause 6 converts the "five gallon" licence into a "twenty litre" licence. Clause 7 provides for the grant of a special licence to the Wilpena Chalet. Clause 8 provides for the grant of special licences to the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner and to authorities engaged in large mining and construction projects. Clause 9 provides for the grant of a special licence in respect of the Cornish Festival.

Clause 10 deals with the conditions of a full publican's licence. The hours for supplying liquor to those taking meals or substantial food in the dining room are extended to 1.30 a.m. The special provision enabling a prescribed tourist hotel to trade up to 3 a.m. is also included in this amendment. Clause 11 deals with the conditions of a limited publican's licence. The hours for supplying liquor in the dining-room are amended in the same way as is proposed in relation to a full publican's licence. Clause 12 makes a metric conversion.

Clause 13 amends the provision relating to wine licences. The hours for supplying liquor to those taking meals or substantial food in the premises are extended to 1.30 a.m. Clauses 14 and 15 make metric conversions. Clause

16 reduces to 2 l the minimum quantity of liquor to be sold in pursuance of a vigneron's licence. It also makes a number of drafting amendments to section 26. Clause 17 enables the court to "tailor" the hours of trading permissible under a club licence to the needs of the particular club. Clause 18 makes a metric conversion.

Clause 19 provides for the conversion of "five gallon" licences into "twenty litre" licences. Clause 20 enables a restaurateur to obtain permission to close his restaurant for one day in each week. The hours during which liquor may be supplied to those taking meals and substantial food in the restaurant are extended to 1.30 a.m. Clause 21 enables the court to grant theatre licences to cinemas. Clause 22 does away with a special provision relating to the duration of a packet licence which is not regarded as necessary or desirable. Clause 23 makes a metric conversion.

Clause 24 enables the court to give an applicant for the transfer of a licence some latitude in the time in which he must furnish a return of the purchases of liquor made by him for the purpose of adjusting licence fees. Clause 25 makes amendments relating to metric conversion. Clause 26 enables the court to permit an objection to be made at any time before the determination of an application. It also permits a person to object where he does not oppose the actual granting of a licence but considers that it should be granted subject to certain conditions. It permits amendment of objections.

Clause 27 enables an objector in effect to "plead the general issue": that is to say, to allege that the circumstances of the applicant's case do not justify the grant of the licence. Clause 28 makes it clear that objections to significant changes to licensed premises may be made on grounds set out in section 48 or on any other grounds that the court may allow. Clause 29 provides for a fine of 10 per cent where a licence fee is overdue for more than 14 days. Clause 30 increases the fee payable upon an application to transfer a licence and provides for 21 days notice to be given instead of 14 days notice as at present.

Clause 31 makes a corresponding amendment to section 52 of the principal Act, which deals with the transfer of a licence upon sale of the licensed premises. Clause 32 provides that a publican may, with the approval of the court, agree to pay a proportion of his receipts obtained on the sale of liquor under a booth certificate to the promoters of the entertain-

ment at which the liquor is sold. Clause 33 enables the holder of a full publican's licence, a limited publican's licence, or a restaurant licence to obtain a permit for the sale of liquor in outdoor areas.

Clause 34 enables licensees of a kind referred to in the preceding clause to obtain special permits for the sale of liquor in the licensed premises on special occasions. This will enable them to trade for extended hours on new year's eve and other special occasions. No more than six permits are to be granted in any period of 12 months in respect of the same licensed premises. Clause 35 enables any club that has been in existence for at least 12 months to obtain a club permit. No club permit is to authorize liquor trading for more than 29 hours a week. Where the turnover in liquor exceeds \$15,000 a year the club must seek a licence.

Clause 36 makes corresponding amendments to section 67a of the principal Act, which enables a club to seek a permit for keeping liquor supplied by its own members upon the premises. Clause 37 makes a metric conversion. Clause 38 expands the powers of the court to cancel or suspend a certificate or permit. Clause 39 repeals section 84 of the principal Act. This section requires the clerk to publish notice of all applications in the *Gazette*. This unnecessarily duplicates other provisions. Notices of the grant of licences and permits are given in the *Gazette* each week pursuant to section 50. Notice of applications is given pursuant to section 41.

Clause 40 enables the court to suspend a licence. This power may be desirable where alterations are being made to licensed premises or where other circumstances arise that prevent proper service to the public for limited periods. Clause 41 removes the provision preventing a visitor from paying for alcoholic drinks in clubs. At the same time the regulatory provisions are tightened by requiring that the member introducing a visitor to a club must insert the name of the visitor in a book kept for the purpose, and sign against his name. Clause 42 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 43 provides that the court must approve the manager of a licensed club. Clauses 44 and 45 make consequential amendments. Clause 46 enables those responsible for the management of a club to be charged where offences against the Licensing Act are committed in club premises. Clause 47 deals with the notice to be displayed by the holder of a wine licence. It also makes a metric conversion. Clause 48 makes a metric conversion.

Clause 49 amends the provision of the principal Act relating to the sale of liquor to underage persons. Where an offence is committed, the licensee as well as the barman is to be guilty of an offence unless he can show that he exercised proper diligence to prevent the commission of the offence.

Clause 50 makes a metric conversion. Clause 51 amends the provision relating to wine tasting. A reference to 21 years is removed and replaced with a reference to 18 years. The amendment was missed when the principal Act was amended by the Age of Majority Act. Clause 52 provides for the appointment of an Assistant Superintendent of Licensed Premises. Clause 53 empowers the Minister of Tourism to declare premises or intended premises to be a prescribed tourist hotel. Clauses 54 and 55 contain evidentiary provisions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of the several sums for all the purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure by the Government for expenditure during the year ending June 30, 1972.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Again this afternoon it has become evident that this Government brings about not action but retraction. This afternoon the Government withdrew two Bills that had previously been before the House, and they are only two of many Bills that have been introduced and then withdrawn by the Government.

Mr. Langley: Name some.

Dr. EASTICK: I will do just that. I have a list of eight Bills, and no doubt other members will be able to refer to others. In relation to the Dartmouth dam, a Bill that was introduced was subsequently retracted and another Bill, which had originally been submitted in April, 1970, was introduced. With regard to shopping hours, there has been a referendum, followed by a debate in this House, and there will be a further debate later today. A laughable situation existed in the case of the entertainment tax which, after applying for only about two weeks, was

retracted. A section of the entertainment tax Bill was so wide open that it would have taken from the people who supported, on an annual basis, football clubs, sporting associations, theatres and other activities a 7½ per cent surcharge by way of entertainment tax on their annual membership fee. So rapidly brought in was the legislation that a hole as big as that was not noticed by the Government. The Bill was later withdrawn.

Even though members of the rural community were able to indicate to the Government the urgent need to reconsider the land tax assessment, we had to go through this whole process of acting and then retracting so that a further assessment could be drawn up. Even with that new definition of assessment we have people living close to Adelaide with properties smaller than 150 acres being denied a special rural reduction. On July 8, the Government gazetted regulations under the Road Traffic Act relating to the towing of trailers and the very next day (not the next week or the next month) a special supplementary *Government Gazette* was issued revoking the regulations which would have made it impossible to tow even caravans. This was the result of hasty, ill-conceived legislation.

When the Labor Government came into office it was presented with the Maunsell report, which recommended the provision of a standard gauge link between Adelaide and Port Pirie. The Government condemned the report but subsequently it accepted it, with minor variations. This was another policy reversal. I now address myself particularly to one aspect of the legislation that was withdrawn in this House this afternoon.

Mr. Langley: Has it been—

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Unley not to interject while I am on my feet. The honourable Leader is out of order in referring, in this debate, to legislation on the Notice Paper.

Dr. EASTICK: Even though it has been retracted, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: It has not been retracted yet.

Mr. Millhouse: That makes the debate clearly unreal.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: Although I have been denied the right to comment at this time, there will be another occasion for me to indicate the loss to the Education Department and other bodies

that have been denied a promise they were given some time ago on school crossings. However, I bow to your interpretation, Mr. Speaker, and will not persist on that note. I refer again to the fact that we have had much evidence of action and retraction. On behalf of the people that Opposition members represent, I say that that is not good enough. It is certainly not acceptable to the people of South Australia.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Mr. Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Rocky River has the call and he deserves the courtesy of the House. Honourable members should not interject while he is on his feet.

Mr. VENNING: Even without saying anything I seem to have upset the members of the Government. It was not my intention to upset the Government. I have heard it said that silence is golden, but I must speak and in doing so refer to some of the shortcomings of this Government. I agree with what my Leader has said, because he thinks as I do. Unfortunately, he was cut short in one of his arguments this afternoon because the subject matter was on the Notice Paper.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The matter has been ruled out of order; therefore the honourable member cannot refer to it even in the way he is doing.

Mr. VENNING: The point has been made. I am concerned at the lack of protection that primary producers particularly are receiving from this Government. It will not be necessary to go into details of the pressure brought to bear on this Government when the assessments sent out by the Valuation Department were wrong. We attended meetings throughout the State to prove to departmental representatives that their assessments were wrong. When we told the Premier that the assessments were wrong, he asked us to cite instances and this we did. As a consequence, the Government acted as it did, so that generally speaking the new assessments were about 50 per cent less than the original assessments. What protection are primary producers going to get from this Government to see that this sort of thing does not happen in the future? It is most unfortunate that we are not allowed to refer to what has been said, but perhaps we can talk about it tomorrow.

We have heard so much about the protection of the consumer by this Government and we hear so much about the freedom of the individual, but these are two contrasting things. I have asked before what protection is this Government giving to the people suffering from the effect of succession duty in this State. If an old lady at Port Adelaide had to get out of her home because she could not pay her rent it would make headlines in the press but today primary producers are being put off their farms because the breadwinner has died early and succession duties have had to be paid. True, the Premier has said in reply to questions that concessions have been given under certain sections of the Succession Duties Act, but in reality many people must sell, if not the whole of the property, at least half of the property in order to pay this unjust property tax. I express my concern at the lack of sympathy and interest that this Government is showing to the primary producers of this State.

It is rather funny, when one asks a question in the House concerning primary producers, to see members on the front bench squirm. I do not know why. Many members have been brought up in the shadows of the tall buildings in the metropolitan area and they do not know much about the problems in the rural industry. However, we hope that we may be able to educate them in time. I invited the Minister of Roads and Transport to come to my place for a weekend so that I could let him know some of the problems, but he was afraid that he would be given sandwiches for lunch. He has been raised in the city, where there are no problems. I want to bring before the Government this afternoon the lack of consideration that it gives, to the extent that it will not listen to members on this side who give the point of view of people in these rural areas but will travel all over the country to get that information.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I am fair-minded and I will praise the Treasurer. When I saw him on a television show recently, I thought he was the greatest socialistic actor in South Australia today. He would be much better suited at one of the Festival of Arts performances. I think he rated great applause, but that was as far as it went. He raised the matter of the Labor Party's policy, but then he said that Sir Thomas Playford's effort in taking over the Electricity Trust was wonderful. I agree that it was.

I also agree that services that are something of a monopoly should be under Government

control, and they operate effectively under that control. However, the Treasurer has said that he will build a road to the Western Australian border and that an enterprise that has been so successful will give him the \$2,000,000 to do the work. Why is that \$2,000,000 available? It is available not because the enterprise has made profits but because it has not had to go ahead with plans made earlier and it does not require the amount of Loan money involved. The Treasurer will come up with a story later, but many millions of dollars have been allocated to the Electricity Trust and, because the trust did not have to go ahead with some developmental plans, the money has become available for another purpose at this stage. When we get down to the facts of life, I am not so appreciative of the Treasurer's effort.

One of his cries in the 1968 election campaign was that, if the people did not vote Labor, there would be a big recession, with hundreds of unemployed. We won Government on that occasion and conditions were better than ever before in South Australia in those two years. We made progress and provided industry. However, now money has been kept in the banks and the people have a psychology of fear. If the Treasurer was a statesman, instead of a cheap politician, he would have tried to build up the confidence of the people in the state of the economy. Instead of doing that, he tried to increase the fears of those who have money available to spend.

The Hon. L. J. King: What would you say—

Mr. McANANEY: I never listen to lawyers on financial matters. Dealing further with the part the Treasurer has played in handling the finances of South Australia, when he was Leader of the Opposition (and it would be better for South Australia if he was still Leader of the Opposition), he spoke of the Keynesian theory, but he has had booming balances in the Loan Fund at present.

He tells us that at the end of June we should get to work and spend the money. We had the stage in history when a more than usual number of young people came on the labour market and the Treasurer, instead of using his Loan programme to take more people on, did nothing other than accumulate money. This showed that he either lacked an administrative policy or that he did not put into effect what he had preached in this House. This state of affairs is most deplorable.

I also point out the hypocrisy of this Government in attacking the wine tax (and

I am not particularly keen on that tax) and then increasing liquor tax and charges on primary industries. I do not need to read out the list of increased charges that have been made. The Treasurer seems to be amazed, but he told the Commonwealth Government that he wanted a reduction in sales tax on motor cars, yet he had legislation passed through this Parliament to increase the cost of owning and running a motor car. He attacks the Commonwealth Government for doing something, but he does something similar himself.

The present Commonwealth Liberal Government has been the envy of the world on employment. The Treasurer is not fond of statistics and he does not look at the figures for America and Great Britain. Progress could have been made if we had leaders and statesmen in South Australia.

Mr. Langley: When are you going to be Premier?

Mr. McANANEY: I have no ambition to be Premier, but I have always tried to act as a statesman, not to get cheap publicity as a politician. The Treasurer does not practice what he has preached regarding the Keynesian theory on money. He looks as though he does not understand that theory, and I know that he does not understand it.

That great old statesman, Sir Thomas Playford, conducted the affairs of the State wisely for many years. When conditions were similar to the present conditions, he always had a reserve of money that he could use to increase the number of persons employed by the Government. He acted when conditions were similar to present conditions. However, the present Government has the money in the bank and it should have increased the degree of spending instead of engaging in technicalities, such as altering legislation. These alterations are necessary, but they do not improve the economy of the State. It is in this area that I say the Government has been sadly lacking: it has not done its job of creating work by speeding these projects up. In the last year this State received the greatest increase in money allocation in Australia and I should have thought that this Government would have been capable of increasing the speed at which new projects were undertaken and with which new plans were prepared. Had the Government been willing, many projects brought before the Public Works Committee could have been begun some time ago, but there has been a great time lag.

Mr. Clark: The Public Works Committee recommended the electrification of the railways 20 years ago. That was in the time of Playford, yet you say he was a good bloke.

Mr. McANANEY: When Steele Hall was Premier and Treasurer he went to Canberra and submitted a carefully documented statement on why this State should receive an increased allocation of Loan money, but what has happened in the last 12 months with the present Government in charge of the Treasury benches? All we got from the present Treasurer was a statement blaming the Commonwealth Government. He said that increased taxation was the wrong policy, yet he has increased taxation over the last 12 months, and there is no more serious built-in component of cost to the consumer than taxation on the goods he buys.

In the matter of population increase, that figure in South Australia has been nearly as low as that in Tasmania and is not increasing nearly as fast as that of other mainland States. This involves confidence in the Government, and many people are leaving this State because of the action taken by the Government. While the population is not increasing in this State there is obviously something wrong with the Government that controls it. I believe that we should be able to expect more of a person in high office such as the Treasurer, who should examine constructive suggestions rather than making mug statements that bring cheap publicity and possibly short-term popularity.

The Minister of Labour and Industry, either inside or outside this House, has advocated the introduction of a 35-hour week. However, the people of South Australia do not want this, as any poll will show. They want more education and better hospitals. The member for Playford rightly referred to the ever-increasing gap between the high-income and low-income earners in the community, but not even those in the highest bracket are happy: they lose as a result of the increased income tax and superannuation deductions to which they are subjected. We must look at this situation as members of the Australian community and make those changes that are fair to all sections of the community.

I believe that the current transport policy will catch up with the Government. The Minister of Roads and Transport has said that he supports recent statements by the Railways Commissioner that lines must be closed if the primary producers do not use them, but there must surely be some definite policy stated and possibly set out in a White

Paper by the Government as to what is the Government's intention concerning our railways. When I first came here eight years ago, the Railways Department paid its own running expenses, but each year it has gone backwards. The Treasurer and the Minister of Education may say they make increased demands on the Commonwealth Government, but such demands are in the long run increased demands on the Australian taxpayer. The Government is making up losses on the services it provides by increasing its demands on the taxpayer, but this is not sound economic or fiscal policy. I call for an inquiry into the railways to see what can be done about lines carrying less traffic. All the experts say that rail transport in excess of 100 miles or 200 miles is the cheapest available, but is this so in Australia?

The losses must be borne by the taxpayer, who, if they can no longer afford to pay for the services provided cannot afford to pay more in taxation. Medical and other services are provided for the sick and elderly as well as for those in other fields, but that is the problem we face today: as we are trying to make one able-bodied group pay for the services provided for other able-bodied groups. I ask what are the basic plans of this Government on road transport. The Minister of Roads and Transport will not tell us what they are.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: A committee has been appointed to consider transport matters, including a dial-a-bus service. I have heard one person involved in this say that it would be ridiculous to try to have a dial-a-bus scheme in the less densely populated areas of Adelaide. Pilot schemes have been introduced into America and probably, in densely populated areas, some type of dial-a-bus system will be introduced. However, it is ridiculous to refer to a committee the possibility of instigating such a scheme in our widely spread suburban areas.

What plans does the Government have for dealing with the increased traffic in this State? The Government should say what is its policy with regard to railway lines, such as the Victor Harbor line, which are little used. The Railways Commissioner has more or less indicated that the policy is to close these lines, but we will have to provide easy access from Glen Osmond and other outer areas to the city, so that people can get to Adelaide without wandering about suburban streets. The Government

has not yet dealt with these matters. Instead, we are dealing with shopping hours and the times at which a person can get a drink. The Government makes no statement of policy on these vital matters, but merely refers them to committees. In fact, in one case a committee has been appointed to look into the report of another committee. The Government should give some definite lead on these matters. Although, as I have said, I give the Treasurer a top rating as an actor for his performance on television, he will not come up with a concrete policy on these issues, which are so vital to the standard of living in this State.

The Treasurer makes a great fuss about price control, but I cannot think of many cases where prices have been found to be too high. The Treasurer gains publicity by saying that he has referred various matters to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. He said that he would refer the increase in doctors' fees to the Commissioner. Why has some statement not been made on whether these increases were justified? The very fact of referring them to the Commissioner implies that they may not have been justified, so it is only just that the inquiry should be made public. The Treasurer tries to obtain political advantage by saying that he is protecting the people, but surely he must tell the people whether these increases are justified. When I asked a question about grocery prices, I was told that the increase was only small. The average wage has increased four or five times more than the increase in prices. The people should be told these facts. The Treasurer has a mania for controlling things; he wants to control everything. The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs has said that, where there is much competition, prices are always reasonable. I do not support the idea of a group of people getting together to fix a price; such increases should be investigated and brought under control. In those cases there could be an excessive increase in price.

The Government is concerned with petty matters, such as the legislation dealing with unordered books. If people send an unordered book through the mail, they take the risk of losing it. I do not believe anyone will be taken to court for failing to return a \$5 book. Much of the legislation introduced by the Government is designed to stop people from doing foolish things, rather than designed to protect a person from the actions of someone else. We are trying to educate our young people, but can we breed a rational, intelligent

population if people must be protected from themselves? In these circumstances people will never learn what they must know. Of course, I realize that action must be taken against any definite fraud, but I believe the Government has gone too far. Although we must protect people against fraud, we do not have to become a "big daddy" in protecting them. Liberal Governments in Australia have also introduced social legislation. I do not wish to prolong this debate—

Mr. Jennings: Hear, hear!

Mr. McANANEY: I know that what I am saying is beginning to hurt members opposite. In reply, the Treasurer will evade statements of fact and, instead, will say that I have been raving like a nut, and will go on in that vein. He looks a bit tired today, and may not be as good an actor as he was on television the other evening. However, he will not say what is his policy with regard to unprofitable railway lines, or the State's transport needs; he will not say how he will make price control more effective. I hope he proves me wrong because, in the interests of South Australia, I would be happy if some definite statement of policy were made on these matters. I hope that, rather than giving us one of his grand-standing acts, the Treasurer makes some sound, wise statement of policy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I wish to refer to two matters briefly at this stage, the first concerning the Attorney-General, and the second, the Minister of Works. First, I refer to the matter of Government policy on censorship and pornography. Today the Attorney-General answered my question about prosecutions arising out of one of the issues of the *Empire Times*. In the course of my explanation of the question I said I had asked questions on the subject eight times over many months, the last question being in November, and that I had had no reply. I do not want to go into all the details of this matter again. I have canvassed in this place the contents of several editions of *Empire Times*. All I can say is that if any publication is contrary to section 33 of the Police Offences Act I should have thought that this publication was. The Attorney-General, however, told me today that it has not been possible to prosecute anyone for its publication. The last time he considered the question of publication I believe a summons was issued which could not be served, and now apparently he says there is not sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution. If that is so, then the law should be altered so that there is such a possibility in this case.

The *Empire Times* is one facet of this matter. The second aspect was the pusillanimous attitude of the Government on the subject of *Oh! Calcutta!* and the refusal of the Attorney-General to do anything about it so that the parties, at very great expense, had to go to court before the matter was resolved. Thirdly, there is the recent matter of the so-called sex shops in South Australia about which, too, nothing has been done by the Government. When the Attorney-General was questioned about the *Empire Times*, not by me but by the member for Hanson, on August 12, 1971, he said:

This means, therefore, that, when investigations have been made and the police have decided to forward a report to the Attorney-General, he must decide whether a prosecution should take place. That is the beginning and end of the matter as far as the Attorney is concerned.

I suggest to him that it is not the beginning and end of the matter so far as the Attorney-General is concerned. If we are to maintain any standards in South Australia then the law must be capable in the appropriate case of punishing those who transgress against those standards. The very fact that the Attorney-General referred this matter to see whether there was sufficient evidence to found a prosecution shows that he was disturbed about it, and I believe any decent person would be disturbed about it. Yet now we have the answer that nothing can be done. I hope that this short protest of mine will do something to persuade the Government and the public generally that the law should be altered so that such publications as the issues of *Empire Times* and others to which I have referred may be prohibited.

This is the only opportunity I can see of raising an issue which is important to me personally. I referred to it by way of question last Wednesday, but I did not receive a satisfactory reply. It concerns what you, Mr. Speaker, have done with regard to accommodation in this building. About a month ago you approached me regarding the room I occupy at present and you then said that in your view the room was not sufficient for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and that the accommodation which I occupied should be improved. You said that you had plans for doing that and by arrangement you, the Clerk and I went to have a look at the caretaker's office downstairs which is now occupied by the member for Gouger. You suggested that this should be improved and that it would make proper accommodation for me. When I questioned

you a little more closely, you said it was necessary to increase staff and so on as a corollary. I found the real reason why you, Mr. Speaker, wanted me out of the room that I have now occupied on and off for seven years was so that, after it had been renovated, the Assistant Clerk could occupy it and so that his room could become a waiting room for people wishing to see the Premier. After consideration, I wrote to you on February 16 a letter to which you have not replied, although perhaps it did not call for a reply. However, I feel that if any action was to be taken it warranted a reply. Apparently, action has now been taken. My letter states:

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I have been thinking carefully about your kind offer to me that I should leave the room which I am at present occupying and go to the one downstairs which you and Gordon Combe showed to me and which would be enlarged and renovated. You explained that you did not think that the present room was appropriate for me and you were anxious that I should have one better.

You mentioned several times that it was necessary to take on extra staff and thus make a re-arrangement of accommodation. I understand, however, that if I were to move downstairs Aubrey Dodd would go to the room I am now using (which would be improved for him) and that his present room would be used either by the Premier's staff or by his visitors waiting to see him.

After consideration I very much prefer to stay where I am. As I mentioned my present room is conveniently placed and even with its drawbacks is comfortable and quite sufficient for me at present.

I suggest that a more economical re-arrangement would be for the Minister at present occupying the room between Aubrey Dodd's and that of the Chairman of Committees to move to the room downstairs leaving his room free for Aubrey Dodd. This would involve the alteration and improvement of only one room instead of two.

The Minister concerned (the Minister of Roads and Transport) occupies the Minister's room next to the Assistant Clerk's room. If the room downstairs is to be as good as the Minister of Works suggested the other day, one would think the Minister of Roads and Transport would be very happy to occupy it, allowing the Assistant Clerk to move into the Minister's room. Whether that has been suggested or not, I do not know.

The next I heard about the matter, having written you a letter, Mr. Speaker, and having received no reply whatsoever either in writing or orally, was to find a couple of chaps in my room the other day measuring it up for alterations. I protest against the discourtesy of this procedure and also against the waste of money

on renovations that are not necessary. I hope that the Minister who you said in reply to my question is responsible for this will think again about the renovations of the room I occupy. I am happy to stay there as it is and, if Mr. Dodd was to move into it, I should have thought it sufficient for him. Even if the Premier had to have a waiting room, it was unnecessary that he should have it at Mr. Dodd's expense or at my expense, because by moving the Minister of Roads and Transport downstairs the whole question of renovation of the room would have been avoided. I believe it had been decided not to go on with renovations in this place and that the only thing that would be done would be urgent maintenance, and that has been said several times until this matter arose. I do not wish to detain the House on what may seem to be a small matter, but I do protest about it.

I remind the House about the other matter which I have raised and which I do not regard as a small matter. Indeed, I regard it as a gaping hole in the policy of the present Government. I know that the Attorney-General has no policy on this matter, that he is subject to pressures from one side and the other, and that he does not know what to do on the matters of censorship and pornography. Well, it is about time the Government did grapple with the problem and did do something so as to maintain at least the present standards within our community.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This is the first opportunity I have had to discuss university fees, about which the Minister of Education made a public statement earlier this year. I consider that the Minister's statement ranks with the one that he made last year announcing he had available \$3,000,000 with which to demolish and improve school buildings. That statement was completely false. He said he believed that the Commonwealth Government had a moral obligation to give us this money. I consider that the Minister's statement about university fees stands alongside that as being the height of absurdity.

This is one of the most nonsensical statements with which he has insulted the intelligence of the people. We know, from the performance by the Minister of Education over many months, the depths of hypocrisy to which he will stoop. The statement about university fees is an example of this. Members who were in the House in 1969, when university fees were debated, will recall that the present Treasurer moved the following motion:

That in the opinion of this House a further increase in fees in tertiary education institutions of this State will cause grave hardship to students and should not be proceeded with.

The present Minister of Education spoke in that debate, but the present Government has increased university fees during the Budget discussions. It did so without consulting the universities, and the Treasurer tried to explain that point. However, I complain about the Minister's nonsensical statement in which he tried to justify the increase in university fees. I have said the statement was nonsensical, but the word "naive" must be applied if the Minister thinks that the statement impressed the consultants and officers in the Commonwealth Treasury in Canberra.

This is the gist of the Minister's submission to Canberra about cutting out university fees, and I am not surprised that it did not take the Commonwealth Government long to consider it. The Minister's statement tells us that he has come up with a brilliant new scheme on university fees. The psychology of this is that the Government recently has increased fees and, to divert attention from that, the Minister has put the heat on the Commonwealth Government.

The statement, which is headed as a type of press release, is supposed to be an outstanding idea from the new Minister. The proposal is that the Commonwealth Government should increase its basis of subsidy for tertiary education from \$1 for \$1.85 to \$1 for \$1. This is another of the Minister's pleas for increased revenue. We have been told that the Minister is highly intelligent, yet his first statement is as follows:

In the first place, the costs to the Commonwealth of Commonwealth scholarships at universities and colleges of advanced education would be reduced to the extent of the tuition fees now paid.

The Minister means that the Commonwealth Government will continue to make available the money that it is making available now. Another way to say that is that the Commonwealth Government is now footing the bill for many students by way of Commonwealth scholarships at universities and colleges of advanced education. The Minister is trying to make out that the Commonwealth Government will save money and that the cost to that Government will disappear. He has not the honesty to say that the Commonwealth Government will continue to make available the money that it is now making available. The statement continues:

On its own I believe that this may well offset about one-third of the extra cost of increasing the subsidy for recurrent expenditure.

What does the Minister mean by "extra cost"? He is trying to delude the public. Is he naive enough to think that he will delude the Treasury officers in Canberra so that they will work on the basis of \$1 for \$1.85 and say that this is the extra cost? Then the Minister states:

Secondly, there would be a further offset through the reduction of tax rebates for parents supporting dependant students at tertiary institutions who are now paying fees.

In other words, extra revenue will be raised by taxation because there is a maximum \$400 taxation rebate for the education expenses of each child. I think that the rate of taxation for a person with a taxable income of \$10,000 is about 50c on \$1, so the taxpayers of this country, including the artisans and tradesmen, who pay most of our taxation, will subsidize the cost of fees. If a person pays taxation of 50c on \$1, the Commonwealth Government will collect \$200 from that person, not \$400, so that statement by the Minister is not worth much. Coming down the taxation scale, on a taxable income of \$4,000 the tax is about 33c on \$1 and, on a taxable income of \$2,000, the rate of taxation is about 20c on \$1.

I point this out to show how nonsensical it is to say that the Commonwealth Government will save money. I am not canvassing whether the people in the low-income group should pay fees, although I have views on that matter, but I am pointing out how stupid is every statement that the Minister makes. He also states:

Thirdly, the Commonwealth Public Service now refunds fees to employees who pass their approved courses. This cost to the Commonwealth would be eliminated under the proposed arrangements.

That statement is completely and patently false. The fees will not be eliminated: they will be paid in another way. The Commonwealth Government will make the money available in another way, but the Minister says that the cost will be eliminated. The Minister also states:

In addition, a significant number of private employers are now refunding fees to employees who pass their subjects either at universities or at colleges of advanced education. This cost to an employer is almost certainly a legitimate cost in assessing taxable income and, as a consequence, company tax collections must be reduced accordingly at present.

Surely the Minister is not suggesting that the extra tax collected from these companies will cover the cost of students' fees. The Minister may be considered in some circles to be a

brilliant economist but, if he is suggesting that (it certainly is the inference), his statement is misleading and, in fact, dishonest. I believe it is not unreasonable of us to expect companies to pay the university fees of their employees, and I do not think it is unreasonable to transfer this cost from the company to the general taxpayer, but surely the Minister is not suggesting that the extra tax collected would cover the fees of employees attending the university. He said that the loss of tax could be eliminated, but I point out that it would add further to the burden of the general taxpayer.

The Minister states that he believes that the combined effect of the areas of saving available to the Commonwealth under his proposal would cover at least two-thirds of the cost of making the suggested change. Of course, that highlights the absurdity of the Minister's statement. The Minister must be more stupid than I thought (that is saying something) if he thinks this is a weighty submission to make to the Commonwealth Government for it to support this brand new scheme. The Minister stresses that "the South Australian Government is gravely concerned at the effect of a continuing level of fees at tertiary institutions in discouraging students of ability from low-income backgrounds from going on to tertiary education". However, the Government's concern was so grave that when this matter came before the Council of the University of Adelaide there was a body of support from the council that we should object to these fee increases. When the council indicated this, it received a letter from the Minister saying that if fees were not increased the sum made available to the university would be cut by \$300,000. This is the attitude of the Minister of Education who, in the debate in 1969, said:

The only justification that the Government can claim for this impost—

referring to an increase in university fees— is that it is short of revenue and that the Commonwealth Government, led by Mr. Gorton, has not given it a fair deal in respect of tax reimbursement grants. All of that is true. However, it is wrong to so levy revenue from university students that certain students are thereby prohibited from attending university.

Later, he said:

It would be better to find the necessary revenue in some other way, because it can be clearly demonstrated from figures that the amount demanded in fees has been increasing at a faster rate than the State Government's contribution to universities.

However, the statement to which I have been referring continues:

Mr. Hudson pointed out that under the existing arrangements when any State Government was in financial difficulties tertiary fees invariably came up for review because a rise in fees was paid for in part by the Commonwealth Government.

But what about the sentiments that flowed from the Minister's silver tongue in 1969? This illustrates his complete hypocrisy and shows how he is trying to divert attention from himself to the Minister in Canberra. Referring again to the Minister's statement from which I have been quoting, I point out that it rounds off the whole situation by referring to a typically bumptious statement made by the Minister. The document states:

Mr. Hudson said he believed that it was time for a detailed examination of the consequences of abolition of tertiary education fees by the Commonwealth Government, and he had asked the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science (Mr. Fraser) to give careful consideration to the new proposal.

This is one of the most stupid statements with which the Minister has seen fit to insult the intelligence of the people of South Australia. He has done it cleverly, but, the sooner he decides to accept his responsibilities and cuts out this nonsense, the better it will be for the sound administration of this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The member for Heysen earlier this afternoon described this as an exercise, and obviously that is what it has been. I appreciate the circumstances in which members opposite want to engage in an exercise. It is necessary to have a few calisthenics at this stage.

Mr. Venning: It's in the normal course of events.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will look deeply at those matters that deserve to be looked at deeply. The Leader gave a list of matters of action and retraction by the Government, and I will deal with a few of those matters in order to show just how much substance they contain. The Leader talked about the Dartmouth dam legislation but, of course, he was not here when the original legislation was discussed. What he apparently does not know is that the basis on which the Government subsequently brought in legislation was to try to carry out the directions of this House and the directions of the people of this State to maintain the rights which this State had previously obtained under the River Murray Waters Agreement for the building of

the Chowilla dam. We tried to negotiate that position over many months. However, the position with which we were faced was that the Commonwealth Government and the other two State Governments said that they had been handed the present position on which they had an advantage and that it did not matter what this Parliament had said or what the South Australian people had said. They said they had an agreement signed by the Hall Government in defiance of the directions of this Parliament and in defiance of the directions of the people of this State and the promises made to them. As a consequence, we could get no movement in the situation without agreeing to something to which we were reluctant to agree.

Dr. Eastick: You must have known it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not know at the very beginning or else I would not have gone through the exercise.

Mr. Coumbe: I believe you knew when you voted in 1970.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No fear, I didn't.

Mr. Coumbe: I'm sure you did.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well the basis on which this matter was debated over a long period, the basis on which it was taken to the public, and the basis on which the public disapproved of what his Party had done. The public indicated what it thought we should do and this Government used its best endeavours to carry out the proposals we put to the people. We went through every exercise involved. The Leader has said that we rejected the Maunsell report and that we then accepted it but, if the Leader bothers to read the report, he will see that is not true.

Dr. Eastick: With minor variations.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They were not minor variations. The Maunsell report, as accepted by the Hall Government, provided that the standard gauge should come to Adelaide, but it left practically all our industrial complex off the standard gauge line, requiring South Australian industry to tranship to the same extent as it was previously required to do. We would have spent \$45,000,000 and still not had an industry on the standard gauge line. That plan was opposed by South Australian industry, and rightly opposed, and it was opposed by this Government. The result of our negotiations is that industry is now on the standard gauge line and, if the

Leader believes that that is a minor variation, let him go to the Industrial Advisory Council, because it does not believe that it is a minor variation. Of course, the Leader is leading a rural party which, at the moment, does not seem to be actively interested in the city at all.

Dr. Eastick: Rubbish!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is the sort of thing the Leader has produced as being a retraction by this Government. He said that occasionally the Government had proceeded with measures after consultation with the people concerned, but with their support and consent, and that after the measures had been introduced, some members on behalf of their constituents, or representative bodies on behalf of their members, had raised objections to the Government, and the Government had said in some cases that the matter deserved looking at. But this is the normal process of democratic action and it is extraordinary that members want to be so stubborn as to introduce measures without taking into account an expression of public opinion.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to do that with shopping hours?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is taking action over shopping hours.

The SPEAKER: Order! A Bill on the Notice Paper cannot be debated in this debate.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you—

The SPEAKER: Order! I want honourable members to listen to what I am saying. I have earlier given a ruling on this matter and I am ruling again now: any Bills on the Notice Paper cannot be referred to in this debate. I hope that my remarks are heard. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has this afternoon been engaged in an exercise of a delaying nature. He has said that we should get on with the projects covered by the Bills on the Notice Paper and, of course, we will get on with them as soon as possible. We then heard from the member for Rocky River, who waxed very eloquent about the Government's not taking sufficient action to protect rural interests. When this Government came to office there was already a valuation of rural properties that had been accepted by the previous Government. We did not act on that: we took immediate action to revise the rural land tax assessments.

Mr. Venning: We had to bring a lot of pressure, though.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That action was taken before there was a question raised in the House on this matter. I promised this before we took office and I took action the moment we got into office.

Mr. Venning: You were still wrong.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are comparative aspects of wrongness because, if we were wrong in doing that, the honourable member's Party was even more wrong in accepting the previous valuation.

Mr. Venning: You brought in another one.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The Valuer-General informed the Government that his reassessment was accurate and I asked for a series of samples to be taken to show whether that was so. During the period between the assessments being posted and the land tax falling due, we accepted the principle that, if land values fell further, we would (and we did) have a further valuation made. We brought before and passed through this House, apart from changes to the quinquennial assessment that had existed for decades under a Liberal Government, a provision that we could have special assessments at any time there was a marked decrease in value. Yet the honourable member says we did nothing to assist rural industries. We brought legislation before this House, although it was never requested by any member on the other side.

Mr. Venning: You asked for a valuation; that's all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rocky River has had his opportunity to debate this question. He is not allowed to debate it twice. The honourable Premier has the right of reply and I ask that interjections cease.

Mr. Venning: I am seeking help.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have given some help to the honourable member. I was also offered help by the member for Heysen when he began by saying that he was praising me. I feared, and rightly, a Greek bringing gifts. We were then treated to another discursive journey round the honourable member's cluttered mind.

Mr. McAnaney: Would you—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order as he is out of his seat.

The Hon. D. A. DUSTAN: The honourable member trotted out some of his fanciful notions on high finance. When I have been asked questions by the honourable member on a number of occasions over the last year, I have been able to give him facts that have brought back some correctness to his attitude towards the Treasury of this State. If I were to take the honourable member's advice and proceed completely to disburse the Loan moneys in hand in South Australia, with no provision against coming years, I should be amazed if I were not then treated to a lengthy discourse by the honourable member on the subject of being spendthrift and wasteful. When I was previously in office as Treasurer, I spent all the money I could lay my hands on to prime the pump in a proper Keynesian situation (the honourable member was at pains this afternoon to refer to Keynes's general theory on the payment of money), and the honourable member was then in the forefront of those who said the Government was utterly spendthrift and improper and had made drains on the Loan funds. We have had this sort of thing from the honourable member before, and he will excuse me if I do not again try to reply to him.

I listened to the member for Mitcham with interest when he was pursuing the matters of prurient interest to which he has recently turned his attention so assiduously. He said the Government had no policy on these matters, but it clearly has a policy, which is that adults in this community should be allowed to read, see and hear what they wish, because the judgment is for them to make. It is not for the honourable member or any other person in the community to set himself up as a censor. I do not believe that the honourable member is so much stronger than the rest of the community that he can examine material which appears to him to be offensive and say, "I am noble and pure; I can reject the corrupting influence of these matters, but I must protect the poor and unfortunate, who could be subject to these subtle and corrupting influences because they are weaker than I." That is not a position that I believe is tenable by someone who calls himself a Liberal.

Mr. Coumbe: You should apply for the position of artistic director of the new theatre company.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member has not met Mr. Anthony Steel, I think he has missed something. He is a very fine officer.

Mr. Coumbe: I referred to the theatre, not the festival centre.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only thing Opposition members can do when I speak is to refer to the fact that at one time I was an official in Actors Equity; you have no other reply. It is about time you had a little ingenuity and thought of something else.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you address the Chair?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is a real departure of great intelligence and originality.

Mr. Goldworthy: There is no doubt about it: you're a smart cookie.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would not claim that for a moment, because I must confess that I listened to what the honourable member said about the circular of the Minister of Education, and I was not able to understand it at all.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I wish to place before the House for consideration Supplementary Estimates totalling \$1,746,000. Before dealing with them in detail, it may be useful to members if I give a brief summary of the present trends on Revenue Account and the possible result for the full year.

REVENUE BUDGET, 1971-72

On September 2 last I presented to the House a Revenue Budget which provided for a deficit of \$7,346,000. In accordance with established practice, departmental appropriations included provision only for rates of pay effective at that time and, in order to give Parliament a realistic indication of the probable outcome of the year's activities, I made allowance for a further \$4,750,000 prospective cost of wage and salary awards beyond the detailed departmental provisions. This figure was taken into account in arriving at the estimated deficit, but was not formally appropriated other than by the special provisions for automatic appropriation of moneys required to meet further awards. As was explained at the time, any additional cost of new awards beyond the \$4,750,000 could be expected in the normal course to be offset only partly by resultant increases in the taxation reimbursement grants.

If we leave aside for the moment the effects of the recent Premiers' Conference, there are several major factors which have tended to boost prospective receipts to a level somewhat

in excess of estimate. Stamp duties on a variety of documents, receipts from hospital fees, and interest on fixed deposits held with the Reserve Bank, are all running above estimate, and the Commonwealth has recently advised that it expects taxation reimbursement grants may be greater than originally expected, mainly owing to the operation of the wages element of the formula which, on the Australia-wide basis used, is thought to exceed earlier expectations by a small percentage. As a partial offset to these factors, pay-roll tax figures to date indicate that for the full year receipts from this source may not be quite up to estimate.

On the payments side, public debt interest contributions and subsidies to country electricity suppliers are both running at levels which suggest they will exceed estimate for the year as a whole. Greater expenditure on the eradication of fruit fly has been incurred as a result of recent outbreaks in the northern and south-western suburbs, and small excess expenditures for a variety of reasons are expected to be necessary in a number of other departments. As usual, a succession of minor salary and wage awards throughout the year has increased the scales for a variety of Government employees, and will cause a number of departments to exceed their formal estimates. This year the national wage case has been deferred so that I am not able, at this stage, to be specific about its probable effect.

At the February Premiers' Conference, the Commonwealth made available to South Australia additional funds of about \$1,600,000 for revenue purposes, \$4,400,000 for Loan works, \$500,000 of authority for semi-governmental borrowing, and \$700,000 for rural unemployment grants. As members will be aware, the Government immediately set in train a number of projects and measures designed both to meet the State's needs for services and to have maximum impact on the unemployment problem. The approved allocations from Revenue Account included \$500,000 for increased work on the maintenance of schools and hospital buildings, accelerated replacement of older Government motor vehicles, increased support of the needy, and a variety of widespread smaller provisions for maintenance, running expenses, and purchase of minor equipment.

These then have been the major influences on Revenue Account since the Budget was presented last September. The best estimate we can make at this early stage is that they

may in total reduce the prospective deficit from \$7,346,000 to perhaps \$4,000,000. In that case the cumulative deficit on Revenue Account at June 30 next, including the \$4,500,000 carried over from last year, would be about \$8,500,000. However, with more than three months still to go, there could yet be factors which will change this picture. The two main factors which could lead to significant variation of this estimate are the timing and extent of the national wage award and the actual final calculation of the formula determining the tax reimbursement grant, which members will recall has in recent years shown some surprising last minute variations. It may be useful to members if I were to explain briefly why Supplementary Estimates may be required in a year in which there is the expectation of improvement on the original Budget.

APPROPRIATION

Early in each financial year Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act (supported by Estimates of Expenditure). If these allocations should prove insufficient, there are three other sources of authority for supplementary expenditure, namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and a Supplementary Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special section 3 (2) and (3):

The main Appropriation Act contains a section which gives additional authority to meet increased costs due to any award, order or determination of a wage-fixing body, and to meet any unforeseen upward movement in the costs of electricity for pumping water through the three major mains. This special authority is being called on this year to cover the larger part of the cost to the Revenue Budget of a number of salary and wage determinations, with a small part of wage increases being met from within the original appropriations. It has fortunately not been necessary to call upon the special authority to cover any part of the cost of pumping water, which will clearly be below the original estimate.

Governor's Appropriation Fund:

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may cover additional expenditure up to the equivalent of 1 per cent of the amount provided in the Appropriation Acts of a year. Of this amount one-third is available, if required, for purposes

not previously authorized either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. As the amount appropriated by the main Appropriation Act rises from year to year, so the extra authority provided by the Governor's Appropriation Fund rises, but, even after allowing for the automatic increase inherent in this provision, it is still to be expected that there will be the necessity for Supplementary Estimates from time to time to cover the larger departmental excesses.

The main explanation for this recurrent requirement lies in the fact that additional expenditures may be financed out of additional revenues, with no net adverse impact on the Budget but a requirement for appropriation, and also that the appropriation procedures do not permit variations in payments above and below departmental estimates to be offset against one another. If one department appears likely to spend more than the amount provided at the beginning of the year the Government must rely on other sources of appropriation authority irrespective of the fact that another department may be under-spent by the same or a greater amount.

The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations, but upon the present outlook the total so available is unlikely to be sufficient to provide for all the larger excesses.

Supplementary Estimates:

Consequently, the Government has decided to introduce Supplementary Estimates designed to cover the estimated excess expenditure in certain of the major areas of the Budget and so to relieve the fund to an extent which will leave ample appropriation authority therein to meet miscellaneous unforeseen expenditures in the next three months or so. The proposals for additional appropriation of \$1,746,000 in all are as follows:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| | \$ |
| Treasurer—Miscellaneous | 390,000 |
| Public Buildings Department | 500,000 |
| Education Department | 300,000 |
| Agriculture Department | 316,000 |
| Minister of Agriculture— | |
| Miscellaneous | 40,000 |
| Department of Social Welfare and of | |
| Aboriginal Affairs | 200,000 |
| | \$1,746,000 |

DETAILS OF APPROPRIATIONS

I shall now explain in more detail the reasons for seeking further appropriation in these particular areas—

Treasurer—Miscellaneous:

At the time the Budget was brought down it was expected that some reduction would be possible in the provision for electricity subsidies in country areas because certain amounts in respect of previous years were paid last year, several of the country suppliers were operating more efficiently, and the approved level of tariffs had risen. However, since then the Electricity Trust has advised that final results for 1970-71 of many country undertakings were rather less favourable than earlier returns indicated, so that it has been necessary to make extra payments in respect of that year, and at the same time to revise upwards estimated subsidies for 1971-72. A further \$240,000 is provided in the Supplementary Estimates.

Interest on trust funds held at the Treasury will also be rather higher than originally estimated due principally to the new housing arrangements, finalized subsequent to preparation of the Estimates, under which the Government pays interest on balances held in the home builders' accounts and the debt services equalization account. In addition, balances held on deposit with the Treasury have been somewhat higher than expected, thereby attracting more interest, but also enabling the Government to earn correspondingly more from interest on fixed deposits with the Reserve Bank. An additional \$150,000 is now provided.

Public Buildings Department:

The necessity to provide extra appropriation authority for the maintenance and repair of education and hospital buildings arises directly from the Government's decision to allocate in this area \$500,000 of the funds made available to it at the Premiers' Conference for the purpose of increasing economic activity. Minor contracts for painting, etc., are being let as quickly as possible to provide greater employment opportunities in the private building sector.

Education Department:

In the primary, technical and teacher education divisions, expenditures on service charges such as fuel, gas, electricity and water, on postage and telephone charges, and for materials and items of minor equipment, are running at levels which suggest that existing provisions will be inadequate. Accordingly, amounts of \$80,000, \$120,000, and \$100,000 respectively have been included in Supplementary Estimates for these purposes.

Agriculture Department:

Following the recent outbreaks of fruit fly in the Prospect, Parafield Gardens and Morphettville areas, the Agriculture Department has taken the usual extensive precautions and engaged in a concerted programme of stripping and spraying. As a result the appropriations for both wages and contingencies will be exceeded, and the Government is now seeking extra authority of \$244,000 through the Supplementary Estimates.

The necessity to provide further appropriation for the purchase of motor vehicles for the Agriculture Department arises directly from a Government decision made after the recent Premiers' Conference to allocate funds for the accelerated replacement of older motor vehicles and the purchase of departmental vehicles to replace use of employees' private vehicles. The increased provision of \$72,000 for this department is the largest individual appropriation. The requirements for other departments will be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund.

Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests—Miscellaneous:

I recently informed the House that the Government considered the export marketing function of the Citrus Organization Committee should be maintained at this stage, despite the decision of a poll of growers to refuse authority for an acreage levy, and that we intended to make a grant towards meeting losses pending a full review of the future of the committee. In accordance with that statement, I have included in Supplementary Estimates a provision for a grant of \$40,000 to cover losses estimated to be incurred this season.

Department of Social Welfare and of Aboriginal Affairs:

When estimates of salaries and wages are prepared for the larger departments, it is established practice to allow for a certain volume of staff turnover through resignations and transfers and a consequent saving of expenditure on salaries and wages while replacements are being arranged. This year has been an unusual one for this department in that it has been able to maintain staff at a high level without much turnover, and as a result of this the Government now finds it necessary to seek an extra \$100,000 of appropriation authority. One of the areas to which the Government gave attention when additional funds were made available at the recent Premiers' Conference was relief of the

ill, the unemployed, and the destitute. Appropriation of a further \$100,000 is now required to cover the costs of an increase in relief scales and the provision of relief to greater numbers of people in distress. The total additional appropriation for the purposes I have explained is \$1,746,000. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1972)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1973.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1973, a sum of \$60,000,000 be granted; provided that no payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ending June 30, 1972, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service or by any regulation or by any award, order or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Mr. CUMBE: I ask the Treasurer whether this motion is in the usual form used each year, apart from the amount, and I also ask him how he has arrived at the amount.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no difference between this and the most recent Supply Bill. It will be necessary for us to have two Supply Bills before the end of this financial year, and they would both need to be for the sum of \$60,000,000. This is the second of these. There will need to be another Supply Bill in the first part of next year before the Budget is introduced, but this motion is completely in accordance with practice.

Motion carried.

Resolution adopted by the House. Bill founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, and read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the appropriation of \$60,000,000 so that the Public Service of the State may be carried on in the early part of

next financial year. As members know, the annual Appropriation Bill does not normally receive assent until the latter part of October and, as the financial year begins on July 1, some special provision for appropriation is required to cover the first four months of the new year. That special provision takes the form of Supply Bills (normally two such Bills each year) and without this Bill now before the House there would be no Parliamentary authority available for normal revenue expenditure from July 1, 1972. This Bill, for \$60,000,000, is in the same form and for the same amount as the first Supply Bill, passed some 12 months ago. It should suffice to cover requirements through July and August. Accordingly, it will be necessary for a second Supply Bill to be submitted to the House in the latter part of August to provide for requirements while the Estimates and the main Appropriation Bill are being considered during September and October.

A short Bill for \$60,000,000 without any details of the purposes for which it is available does not mean that the Government or individual departments have a free hand to spend, as they are limited by the provisions of clause 3. In the early months of 1972-73, until the new Appropriation Bill becomes law, the Government must use the amounts made available by Supply Bills within the limits of the individual lines set out in the original Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates approved by Parliament for 1971-72. In accordance with normal procedures, members will have a full opportunity to debate the detailed 1972-73 expenditure proposals when the Budget is presented.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUDGES' SALARIES) BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1971; the Industrial Code, 1967-1971; the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1971, and the Licensing Act, 1967-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It increases the salaries payable to the Honourable the Chief Justice, Their Honours the Judges of the Supreme Court, the President and Deputy President of the Industrial Court, the

Senior Judge and Judges of the Local and District Criminal Court and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Licensing Court. The salaries payable to the occupants of these offices were last adjusted by the Statutes Amendment (Public Salaries) Act, 1970, and the Supreme Court Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1970.

Since that adjustment, the Government has had regard to movements in salaries of persons holding comparable judicial offices in the other States of the Commonwealth. In New South Wales and Victoria there have been recent increases in judicial salaries of the order of 20 per cent to 25 per cent. Other States will shortly follow suit. The Government has reviewed judicial salaries in the light of these movements. In all the circumstances, the Government has come to the view that an increase of the order proposed in this Bill is proper.

To consider the Bill in some detail, Part I is formal. Part II at clause 4 increases the salary of the Honourable the Chief Justice from \$23,000 to \$28,200 and the salary of Their Honours the Judges of the Supreme Court from \$21,000 to \$25,750. Part III at clause 6 increases the salary of the President of the Industrial Court of South Australia from \$18,000 to \$22,000 and that of each Deputy President from \$16,500 to \$20,200. Part IV at clause 8 increases the salary of the Senior Judge under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act from \$18,000 to \$22,000 and that of the judges under that Act from \$16,500 to \$20,200. Part V at clause 10 increases the salary of the Chairman of the Licensing Court from \$16,500 to \$20,200 and that of the Deputy Chairman of the court from \$15,000 to \$18,400.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Enfield General Cemetery Act, 1944-1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Enfield General Cemetery Trust was constituted under the Enfield General Cemetery Act, 1944, to establish and administer a public cemetery to serve the developing areas north of the City of Adelaide. Funds for the establishment and early development were

provided by the Government, which made repayable advances to the trust. From early in its life the trust has suffered financial problems owing to the high costs of development and maintenance and the insufficient patronage of the cemetery it has developed. In an attempt to overcome these problems, the trust entered into an agreement with a company for the preselling of leases of burial sites but the scheme had only limited success. This company is now in the process of liquidation and the income to the trust from the preselling of leases by the company has ceased. Recently the trust established a crematorium, which has also proved to be a burden on its finances. From the way he is laughing, I am sure this must be giving the member for Mitcham much pleasure.

Mr. Millhouse: No. It is only because of the stilted language you are using in your speech.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Following reports from the Auditor-General of deterioration in the financial affairs of the trust, an investigation was made by the inspecting accountant of my department. Arising from that officer's report it is desired to place the affairs of the trust under more direct Ministerial control and, in view of the Government's involvement in the financial affairs to give greater governmental representation on the trust. The Bill contains provisions whereby, by the giving of directions, the Minister may exercise more effective control over the affairs of the trust. When considering the trust's affairs, the Government felt that provision should be made in this Bill for the appointment of two additional members, one of whom will be nominated by the Treasurer and one by the Minister.

When the proposal for the appointment of the two additional members to give greater governmental representation was discussed by the trust, the view was expressed that the various religious denominations might care to reduce their representation from the present three members to only one member. Agreement with the heads of the religious denominations concerned has now been reached that the Bill should provide for the Governor to appoint to the trust only one church representative for each term of four years whose function will be to represent all religious denominations. The appointee will be nominated successively by the head of the Church of England in Adelaide or the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Adelaide or by the Minister who,

in the last mentioned case, must be of the opinion that he is representative of other religious denominations. Each appointee will be appointed for a term of four years.

The trust is at present formulating plans which will help it to improve its current financial position and to maintain viability. To carry out these plans it is necessary to give greater flexibility of powers to expend revenues. Because of the current financial position of the trust and the possible delay in the selling of land to provide working funds, the Bill makes provision for the Treasurer to guarantee an overdraft granted to the trust by any bank. The Bill also repeals the fourth schedule to the Act which deals with certain financial aspects of the trust's affairs. The Bill, however, replaces the fourth schedule with provisions in the Act which give some flexibility to the financial obligations of the trust. I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill.

Clause 2 provides for the Bill to be brought into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 preserves the present composition of the trust until a day to be fixed by proclamation for the purposes of section 5 of the Act and as from that day reconstitutes the trust with the same number of members as at present except that instead of three church representatives there will be one who shall be selected in rotation upon nomination by the head of the Church of England, or the head of the Roman Catholic Church or the Minister, and who will represent all the religious denominations in South Australia. Clause 4 is consequential. Clauses 5 and 6 are desirable Statute revision amendments which do not affect the present construction of the Act. Clause 7 enacts a new section 16a which brings the trust under more effective Ministerial control.

Clause 8 amends section 22 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (2), which deals with the application of the proceeds of sale under that section in the manner provided in the fourth schedule, and inserting a new subsection providing for those moneys to be applied in such manner as the Minister may, from time to time by writing addressed to the trust, direct. Clauses 9 and 10 (a) and (b) contain similar amendments to the amendment made by clause 8. Clause 10 (c) incorporates into section 23 of the principal Act some essential provisions of the fourth schedule which would otherwise have been repealed with the repeal of that schedule. Clause 11 repeals section 24 of the principal Act and re-enacts it in slightly wider terms with power to the

Treasurer to guarantee the repayment of any overdraft of the trust upon such terms and conditions as the Treasurer thinks fit.

Clause 12 allows the trust to apply its revenue in such manner as the Minister approves, and repeals the present section 25 which sets out rather rigidly the order in which the trust's revenue must be applied. Clause 13 makes two consequential amendments to section 26. Clause 14 makes a decimal currency conversion.

Clause 15 makes a consequential amendment to section 39. Clause 16 makes a decimal currency conversion. Clause 17 up-dates an obsolete reference to the Corporation of the Town of Enfield in section 44. Clause 18 repeals the fourth schedule to the principal Act. Clause 19 up-dates the fifth schedule to the principal Act by omitting obsolete parts and making decimal currency conversions in relation to the current and future liability of the trust to pay local government rates. The Bill is in the nature of a hybrid Bill and will be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (TRADING HOURS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from March 15. Page 3903.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill involves a most vexed question that has no simple answer. Indeed, attitudes toward it differ among the varying industries within the complex of retail trading. The question involved is not answered by this Bill. In the early press today we find that the views of the Retail Traders Association are held by many people, yet in the late press we find the retail food group indicating that even the association's proposal is unacceptable. Neither group involved in this matter will have the Government's proposal, particularly clause 5, as neither is satisfied that it is the answer. My Party believes that the decision can well be left to the processes of the Industrial Commission.

Mr. Payne: Which Party are you speaking for?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the Party which for many years has given valuable service to the community.

Mr. Payne: And did nothing whatever about shopping hours!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: The Bill was introduced by the Minister in what I consider to be a most complacent way, the first sentence of his explanation being:

It seems hardly necessary for me to explain this Bill.

What a lazy and disinterested sort of Minister the Government has to make such a statement, which is designed to keep people in the dark. The Minister went on to say that "shop trading hours have been the subject of discussion in recent years in this House and in the press to a much greater extent than most public issues".

The Hon. D. H. McKee: When you were in Government you never had the guts to do anything.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is trying to make a contribution on a Bill before the House and is entitled to have the courtesy of Ministers and other members of this Chamber. I will not be continually rising to my feet and calling people to order. There is ample opportunity under Standing Orders to answer this matter in debate, and I will not have this continued interruption. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The presentation of this measure leaves much to be desired. Indeed, this whole matter has been an emotional issue for a long time.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Dr. EASTICK: This subject is charged with much emotion. One Government member suggested that all the emotion might be coming from one source. However, in this connection I wish to refer to some recent press headlines. A headline in the *Advertiser* of March 11 says "Shop Hours Ballot has no Effect—Union Chief". Then, under a photograph of the Branch Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union, Mr. E. J. Goldsworthy, much information is given about a ballot conducted at the Myer store. Mr. Goldsworthy was reported as saying that he was not going to have any part of the ballot because it was not union-organized. That is interesting, because one can say positively

that at least 90 per cent of the rank and file workers at that store are members of his union. The store has an agreement with the union whereby it employs union labour. Even though the poll was conducted by rank and file workers, Mr. Goldsworthy would pay no regard to it. An article headed "Vote for Shop Plan" in the *News* of March 10 says:

A total of 126 Myer shop assistants employed at Tea Tree Plaza today voted in favour of the retailers' roster plan for Friday night shopping.

Under the heading "Plan Lay-off Fear" a further press report says:

A mass meeting of shop assistants was warned today that thousands of retail workers would be sacked if union proposals on Friday night shopping were endorsed by the Government.

An article headed "Retailers will Fight Shop Hours Bill" in the *Advertiser* of March 10 said that Myers planned a ballot and that shops had warned that prices would rise; it was stated that a no-roster plan would mean price increases of more than 5 per cent. So, we can go right back to 1970, when we discussed the shopping hours referendum and associated amendments to the Industrial Code. Much emotion has been generated from both sides.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Apparently that has been your problem.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister showed much emotion just before the dinner adjournment. He should face up to the responsibilities of his office, behave himself, and consider the subject matter before the House. In this place on October 27, 1971, the Premier said:

If any change is to be made it must be made on the basis that there is adequate protection for the workers and traders involved—

I do not dispute that—

and, what is more, it must be made on the basis that action be taken in such a way as to minimize cost increases to the public.

On the same day the Premier said:

. . . this Government is concerned to ensure that that greater cost is minimized and that the way any extended trading hours occur should be at the minimal cost to the community.

. . . I assure the Leader that action will be taken on this matter, and it will be taken in a way that maximizes the benefits and protections for every sector of the community involved. When that has been done and when general agreement has been reached, action will be taken by the Government.

That now sounds rather hollow. On a number of occasions the Government has made an arrangement with the parties concerned—both

the union and the traders. This arrangement was documented in a letter dated February 22 from the Retail Traders Association to the Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union. Other Opposition members will refer to that document in due course. On February 23, after a conference involving Government members and representatives of the Retail Traders Association (but unfortunately not the union representative, because he was unable at the last moment to attend) it was stated, "Yes, this will be it. There are one or two minor arrangements to be sorted out, but in due course it will be decided whether it should be done by legislation or in the commission." Then, as the press and other documentary evidence will attest, there was a backing down and an alteration of opinion. Suddenly the Government was being talked to by outside bodies, and eventually the Government was directed by an outside body.

The union Secretary has been very frank in his discussions with the Retail Traders Association, and I have no doubt that he has been frank with the Government. He was most frank when I spoke with him yesterday about what he regarded as the needs of the union members but, in checking out this matter, one finds that the same gentleman is not only Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union but also Secretary of several other unions. Further, he is a member of the Trades and Labor Council and the Australian Council of Trade Unions. Good luck to him! I congratulate him on his being able to attain those positions. However, I ask the House: who pulled the mat from underneath the arrangement that was current on February 23? Was it the Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union or a member of the Trades and Labor Council or a member of the A.C.T.U.? Who altered the situation that was mainly acceptable on February 23? We have had a variety of documents and information from many quarters, some of which I have found to be unfair and couched to give a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. I have a copy of a publication of January 11, 1972, headed "Shop Assistants Union" which in large letters states:

Victory, plus five day week, Monday to Friday, plus one late night with no Saturday work.

The word "no" is underlined. However, we have to read the document to find out that there is more information than this, because the publication states:

The Government will not legislate for shops to close on Saturdays, and this will allow staff

to work on alternate Saturdays with no Friday work or on Friday night with no Saturday work.

What is the true situation? This document was circulated by the union, it claims victory, and it states on the front page that shop assistants will have one late night with no Saturday work and it then gives an entirely different story inside. I shall not refer to the events that have unfolded in this House even in the short time I have been here regarding this legislation. We have spoken many times of the meeting at Klemzig. There is documentary and photographic proof that prior to a decision on another matter there was a meeting at Klemzig; there was a direction, and there was a change of heart by the Government. A letter from the Retail Traders' Association pointed out that, until February 23, it was happy with its association with the Premier and it was happy with the discussions to that point of time. I know it has not been happy since that time. On October 27, 1971, in reply to a question to which I have already referred, the Premier said:

Does the honourable member really think that members of the association are in business merely for their health? They are in it to make a quid.

I do not dispute that statement, but it is what comes after that which is important. He continues:

I wish he would talk to them—

referring to one of the members on this side—because, having done their calculations, they know perfectly well that they are not going to sell markedly more goods in total . . .”

Here is an admission by the Premier that he appreciated that the association was able to do its homework and was able to come up with the correct answer. We then find from statements that have subsequently been made that suddenly the association is considered to be unable to do its homework correctly and that the document forwarded and made available on the advantage of its system, and other systems, is considered incorrect. How can we accept that it knows how to do its homework on one day yet it does not know how to do it on another day?

On February 23 there appeared to be a degree of acceptance to both the Government and the association. At that time discussions were proceeding with the union Secretary, but nowhere do we learn that several other unions were involved also. The matter was promoted as involving only the Shop Assistants' Union, but we find also that the figures and documenta-

tion relating to a vote taken by a large number of people in the Myer establishment, and taken in the presence of people elected by the employees to conduct a ballot—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections from both sides. The Leader of the Opposition is entitled to be heard in silence.

Dr. EASTICK: Many more people were present than attended the monthly meeting of this union, a meeting for which there was no agenda and no notice of meeting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: It is interesting to receive the comments from members opposite. A meeting of the union was held without notification to the membership or notification of the meeting's subject matter. From this much smaller meeting, attended by a maximum of 200 people (some say 150 and others say 120), a decision that changed the agreement and created further turmoil was reached. I make it clear that I have no argument with unions. Ever since I graduated I have been a member of a professional union and have paid its fees: I am happy to do so.

Mr. Payne: Does it send you notices?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, it does. I have had delivered to me many statements signed by employees of retail traders in South Australia. The first is from the Grundy Shoe Store, 186 Rundle Street, Adelaide, and signed by seven employees, who state that they wish to work on the basis of the plan put forward by the Retail Traders Association. Another comes from the Barlow Shoe Store, 67 Rundle Street, Adelaide, and the employees state:

We, the undersigned, object strongly to the shopping hours as proposed by the Premier on March 15.

In this case, 15 employees signed. I have the signatures of 36 permanent members of the staff at Fletcher Jones and Staff (South Australia) Proprietary Limited of Hindley Street. As they have also been gracious enough to put their address, I can see that some come from Croydon Park, Brighton, Evandale and elsewhere. They support the R.T.A. proposal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not continually rise to my feet to call to order members on both sides. As I have said before, the honourable Leader has the right to be heard in silence.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Sir; the truth always hurts. I have the signatures of nine employees of Judd's Shoe Store in Rundle Street. I have a letter dated March 21 from four employees of Dainty Walk Shoe Salon of Rundle Street. I have also received this afternoon a petition, although not in correct form, from 231 employees of David Jones (Adelaide) Limited as follows:

We the undersigned being employees of the retail trade express grave concern about the proposed legislation dealing with shopping hours and working hours for retail employees. We wish it to be known that having considered all alternative arrangements we believe the proposal put forward by the Retail Traders Association is in the best overall interest of the public, the employees, and employers of the retail trade, and we the petitioners request Parliament to act accordingly.

I have another petition in similar terms signed by 131 employees of the same organization. On the second petition, the addresses are given, and they include Albert Park, Prospect, Taperoo, Semaphore Park, Croydon, Blair Athol, Parkside, and so on. Many of these people are represented by members opposite. However, judging from comments made by Government members, these people will be denied what they ask.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How many people voted against you at the last election? Do you take any notice of them?

Dr. EASTICK: I take notice of people who voted for me and of those who voted against me.

Mr. Payne: In that order?

Dr. EASTICK: No. The honourable member should not judge other people by what he does. These letters and petitions express the thoughts of people in the community today. They have expressed themselves in this way, and also by voting in polls of which the unions will take no notice. No doubt these views have been expressed verbally to all members. Earlier today, I discussed the matter briefly with several people (admittedly not a wide cross-section). I discussed it with about 30 people in Hindley and Rundle Streets, and I found considerable confusion about precisely what they wanted. However, when I spoke to the people who worked behind the counter in these establishments, I found an almost total acceptance of the R.T.A. proposal.

Mr. Wright: Was the boss listening when you asked?

Dr. EASTICK: No, he was not there and he was not invited. As I have pointed out,

all members of Parliament should be concerned about the interests of the people who work in this industry. I have found out that amongst the major retailers there are two different views: one is expressed by those involved in the food industry, and the other by those involved in the normal departmental stores. In this Bill, which is presented by a Government whose members claim that they are interested in workers, provision is made to the effect that workers could be required to work until 12.30 p.m. on a Saturday.

Mrs. Byrne: They never have been.

Dr. EASTICK: If they never have been, why should this provision be in the Bill?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It's always been there. It was in the old Act.

Dr. EASTICK: I am talking about this Bill, and not about the old legislation. I know that 12.30 p.m. was discussed on an earlier occasion in relation to the hairdressing industry, and I appreciate that people in that industry accepted that time because it afforded people who worked elsewhere the opportunity of using such facilities before they went home to enjoy the weekend. However, this Government, which says it is so keen to represent the interests of working people, has left in this Bill a provision whereby at some stage (and it may not be next week or even next year) workers could be expected to work until 12.30 p.m. At the appropriate time, I will ask members to consider altering that time.

I reiterate that I am aware that there is confusion on this matter. As I have said, Opposition members do not want people in the industry to have to work beyond a given point of time. We believe that the payment of employees can best be worked out by the Industrial Commission, rather than by providing for this in a Bill. I support the second reading, but I give notice that in due course—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot refer to amendments at this stage.

Dr. EASTICK: I am not attempting to do so. However, I accede to your implied request, Sir. I support the second reading.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I support the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition gave us nothing to put our teeth into. He made no valid objections at all. He raised only two points, which I shall deal with. The balance of his speech was not worthy of comment: it contained nothing pertaining to the Bill. The

Leader spoke about rates of pay and said that it would be proper for the Industrial Commission to set the rates for overtime work. Obviously, the Leader has not read the Bill, because it provides for overtime rates to be set by the Industrial Commission, so how can the Leader make a statement of that kind? Then, dragging the bottom of the barrel, he spoke of a "secret" meeting at Klemzig. That was a meeting at Klemzig of members on this side in our own registered club, in a room where we have our meetings whenever we so desire.

Mr. Mathwin: Why do you go in the back door?

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member is mad. There is only one entrance, so he does not know what he is talking about. Many of our sub-branches, including mine, use this club for monthly meetings, and that is why we were at Klemzig. It irritates me to hear members opposite, particularly the new Leader, speak of secret meetings. What body of people, after recent happenings, should know more of secret meetings than Opposition members? Loyal members of the Party attended the meeting at Klemzig, and perhaps I should apologize for using the word "loyal" in this House having regard to some of the people opposite. I support the Bill.

Mr. McAnaney: Why?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: I support it because it represents the Government's action to reconcile a situation that involved three sections of the community, namely, the shop assistants, the trade union organization concerned, and the general public. To reconcile three extremely divergent points of view was a difficult challenge, but we have now provided the workers in that industry, the shop assistants, with a 40-hour five-day week, for which they have striven over the years but have not been able to get. Because of the courage and integrity of this Government, this item of policy will be carried out.

The Bill provides that there shall be extended shopping hours on Friday night and that Saturday morning trading shall take place. The R.T.A. agrees with this, but on its own terms, because at present work is carried out on Saturday morning in retail emporiums in the metropolitan area and their staff are paid a paltry loading instead of what they should get and, in my opinion, will get, namely, time and a half, for their efforts. It is the accepted

norm for industrial commissions to pay one and one-half times the ordinary rate for the first hours of overtime. In my opinion, this will apply to work on Friday evening and Saturday morning. It is not a new factor in the affairs of the Shop Assistants Union to seek this 40-hour week in five days, because, as I have said previously, there have been many efforts to gain this benefit for its members, but these efforts have always failed. The industry in which members of the Shop Assistants Union work is one of the most disgracefully low-paid industries in Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: Yet you compel them to join the union, don't you? They were happy.

Mr. WELLS: Of course they join the union, because—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: —the union tries to improve the conditions of members, and that is what the union is for.

Mr. McAnaney: Is membership voluntary or compulsory?

Mr. WELLS: It is voluntary. Many employees are not members of the union, to their shame.

Mr. McAnaney: They're compelled—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McAnaney: —when they don't want to join.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey is addressing the House, through the Chair, and the debate will continue along those lines. Only one speaker will be permitted at a time.

Mr. WELLS: The adult male shop assistant gets the magnificent sum of \$55.20 a week! That is a disgustingly low stipend and, if he is married and has children, he is required to keep a family on this wage. The adult female receives the magnificent sum of \$43.40, and the junior of 16 years or 17 years gets about \$17 a week. The junior rate increases according to age until males get \$55.20 a week and females get \$43.40 a week.

Let us examine, for the benefit of members opposite, the amount of money paid to shop assistants, regardless of whether they are members of the union, who are required to work on Saturday morning. Under this vile loading they are forced to accept at present, an adult male who works on Saturday morning gets the magnificent \$1.08 over and

above his weekly wage for his Saturday morning work! If the person concerned is an adult female, she gets about 85c, and a junior of 16 years or 17 years gets the wonderful sum of 38c for the morning's work!

Mr. Brown: And what about the bus fares?

Mr. WELLS: Yes. Many of these people cannot even afford a pushbike on that wage, so they must travel by bus. It is obvious to every member that the amount paid for Saturday morning does little more than pay the travelling expenses to and from work for the adult. If the junior comes from one of the far-flung districts such as Elizabeth or Brighton, he works on Saturday morning for nothing, because for so long he has been ground into the dirt by being compelled to accept a 40-hour week worked in six days. That is one reason why we want to change the situation. However, the R.T.A. does not want the situation changed. The Leader said that the Government had been instructed by outside bodies, but it is his Party that has been instructed by outsiders, namely, representatives of the R.T.A.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: Members opposite receive their instructions from the Establishment.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have warned honourable members on one occasion that, while the member for Florey is addressing the House on this important matter, the House should at least be able to hear him.

Mr. WELLS: The R.T.A. wants the employees to carry the financial burden of the work and time put into the firms' service, and it wants to cover any discrepancy or increase in running costs that may be incurred.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: So that the firms can maintain their profits.

Mr. WELLS: The whole crux of the matter is that the association it determined to maintain its exorbitantly high level of profit. The association says it is concerned only with the welfare of its employees. Has anyone ever heard such tripe? It is well known that the only action it ever takes is action designed to protect its level of profits, and that is what it intends to do in this case at the expense of the workers. In fact, shop assistants work overtime, the overtime hours worked are computed, and the employees concerned take time off in lieu. I remind the House that they receive the

magnificent loading that I quoted previously, but I met many people who considered that they were being paid for the Mondays when they were rostered off. When I told them that they were not being paid but that it was time off in lieu, they were astounded. I am sure that even now many shop assistants are not aware of the situation confronting them. Contrary to the association's roster plan, the Government proposes a realistic gain in the way of additional take-home pay for people who work Friday evening and Saturday morning.

After all, not many shop assistants go to work to wear out their old clothes; they desire to look after their families. Under the Government's scheme, if an adult male works on Friday evening and Saturday morning, he will receive an additional \$12.24 for working six hours, provided the rate of time and a half is set by the Industrial Commission. This is a worthwhile gain for the shop assistant, and the adult female and the junior, who would be paid according to the same formula, would also receive significant increases in their take-home pay. Despite the association's claims that it wishes to help shop assistants, I point out that the court records will prove that on an Australia-wide basis the Shop Assistants Union made more than 100 applications (first, to the Arbitration Court and, secondly, to the Industrial Commission) to have its working week reduced from 5½ days to five days, involving a total of 40 hours. If the association is so greatly concerned about the welfare of the workers under its jurisdiction, where was it when the union was fighting for these benefits for its members? It was in court opposing the applications! That is a disgusting state of affairs which completely explodes any suggestion that the association is trying to improve the lot of its members.

Dr. Tonkin: How many shop assistants in South Australia are members of the union?

Mr. Langley: Not enough!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: I am surprised that the member for Bragg asks such a question, because it has no bearing whatsoever on the Bill.

Mr. McAnaney: You ignored it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If members are going to disregard the Chair, I must warn them that they will suffer the consequences of being named. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I should not answer interjections, but I must say that we do not ignore those who are not union members; we hope they will join the union. Of course, this Government legislates for everyone, whether he is a union member or not. The R.T.A. says that employees will have voluntary overtime; further, it says that if employees work under the Government's proposition they will be compelled to work overtime. However, that is not correct; nothing in the Bill makes overtime compulsory. Shop assistants will want to work overtime because overtime pay is the cream in their pay envelopes.

The form of compulsion adopted by the R.T.A. in respect of overtime is that, if a man has the temerity to refuse to work overtime, he will be dismissed; that is the association's weapon. Therefore, the R.T.A. made a very improper statement in its advertisement. The R.T.A. is so concerned about the welfare of its employees that it publishes full-page advertisements warning of the viciousness of the Labor Government's proposal! After saying that the Government's proposal will adversely affect people, the R.T.A. asks shop assistants to see how its proposal will work. However, I am afraid that many people who look at that proposal do not fully understand it.

I suppose the R.T.A.'s advertisements would cost \$1,500 a page. When we take into account the cost of other advertisements, we can see that the R.T.A. has no concern for the welfare of its employees. It has embarked upon a campaign of fear. It would have been better for the R.T.A. to reduce prices in its stores than to spend money in such a futile manner. The R.T.A. has stooped to pretty dubious practices in its campaign against this Bill: its campaign is being waged not in the interests of shoppers but in the interests of the association's own profits, which it fears may be eroded when this legislation goes on the Statute Book. The campaign involves employees of members of the R.T.A. being required to telephone their local member and, in parrot fashion, to say, "I support the R.T.A. roster system." However, members can get very few such people to give more details; very few people know what the proposition is.

Of course, the workers have a right to their own opinion, but what I object to is that the employees are forced to telephone their local member. Members on this side can verify what I have said. A supervisor went to shop assistants and said, "You go and ring your member",

and they went. The shop assistants have told us that they did not want to telephone their local member, but they were told to do so. I have personally experienced the aftermath of that situation. This morning people have telephoned me saying, "Take my name off in connection with this matter." When they telephoned on the first occasion they had been coerced. Much has been said about the ballot that was conducted in some shops. Of course, there is nothing more despicable than a ballot conducted under coercion. The General Manager of the firm, after addressing the employees for 20 minutes, concluded by saying, "If you accept our proposal, your jobs will be all right and you will have overtime but, if you accept the Government's proposal, 200 will go off immediately." That is intimidation and coercion, and it is a disgusting tactic. Further, I am ashamed to say that it came from a firm based in Australia.

The R.T.A. has had much to say about increased prices. The association says, "We want our employees to be happy and we do not want prices to rise. We do not care about ourselves." They are sharks at any time. I maintain that members of the R.T.A. can very well bear the bulk of any increases that may be necessary as a result of the Government's policies being implemented. Extracts from financial statements of the firms concerned bear out my contention that they can well afford to pay their employees a decent wage and absorb any cost increases. In the *Advertiser* of March 11 Sir Edward Hayward, the Chairman and Managing Director of John Martin and Company Limited, is reported as saying that in the first half of 1971-72 his company showed a net profit of \$1,021,898. That firm is paying a 13 per cent dividend. Another financial statement revealed that the turnover of G. J. Coles and Company Limited was \$383,000,000—an increase of 10.6 per cent. The *Advertiser* of February 24 reported that Woolworths had made \$8,600,000.

Dr. Tonkin: How many shareholders are there in that company?

Mr. WELLS: I do not know or care, but it was a 13 per cent return on investment. It is the loan sharks, the people who invest money, who are sucking the blood of the workers. In the *Advertiser* of April 8, 1971, it was disclosed that the Myer Emporium for the first half year of trading had made \$9,460,000 profit, and it ended the year with \$16,000,000 profit. However, that company cannot afford to pay its workers a decent living wage.

Dr. Tonkin: What does that represent as a percentage return?

Mr. WELLS: It must be satisfying for the company concerned or its capital would not be in it. How can employers who make such gigantic profits be excused from meeting their requirements and commitments and from paying their employees a decent equitable wage? Shop assistants currently earn \$55.40, which is a disgusting figure. The Government proposal will greatly assist employees striving to make ends meet on their \$55.40 a week wage. The Bill presented to this House by a most capable Minister does much for the members of the Shop Assistants Union and the community at large. I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This Bill is remarkable for three things. First, it is a monument to the ineptitude and incompetence of the Government when it is faced with a tough issue; secondly, it is a monument to the Government's political opportunism; and, thirdly, it is the best example that we have had during the life of the present Government of its domination by the trade union movement.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the short period that my light shone over the Labour and Industry Department we proceeded with considerable caution, and I have no doubt that the present Minister and his predecessors wished that they had proceeded in the same way because, if they had, they would not be in the mess which the present Government is in. I intend to deal with those three aspects of the matter, and those only. I intend to show chronologically recent developments and to use a transcript that has come into my hands of the speech made on television by the Premier on shopping hours last Wednesday evening. I will go no further back than the policy speech he gave before the last election, and I will quote all he said so that no member can say I am quoting of context. On page 28, the Premier said:

To ensure the health of the industries involved and to restrain prices— something that the Government has now forgotten—

a Labor Government will amend the Early Closing Act to provide—

Five day week baking throughout the State.

Five-and-a-half-day retail butchering throughout the State.

Revision of the list of exempt goods and shops—

and this is the rub—

No extension of Friday night shopping beyond areas where it now obtains.

That is all that the Premier said in the policy speech about shopping hours. What did he say last Wednesday night about what he had said in his policy speech? This is what he said:

In the elections the Government promised that Saturday afternoon and Sunday shopping would cease in South Australia—

I do not know in what authoritative document he said that, because he did not say it in his policy speech—

but that Friday night shopping in the outer metropolitan area would remain as it was. In the inner city area things would remain as they were.

That is what he said in the policy speech and that is what he now says he said at that time. It was not long, however, before that policy was changed, and he said last Wednesday evening, "We soon found this unworkable, so we gave the people a vote." In other words, we had a referendum to get the Government off the hook, and the Government expected confidently that a "Yes" vote for Friday night shopping would be returned. That was the expectation of the Government and of many members of the community. Of course, the result was to the contrary. The referendum was defeated by a wide margin, although the geographical differences of opinion showed clearly, and that is the root cause of the Government's present dilemma. Not only did the result go the other way but the direct cost to the Electoral Department was over \$72,000, as we have already heard, and the cost to commerce and the Shop Assistants Union must have been high. I should guess that that referendum cost the community about \$200,000, for nothing at all. Besides the \$200,000 in what was supposed to be a compulsory vote, more than 50,000 people did not vote, but fewer than 200 of these were prosecuted. In other words, the referendum turned out to be a complete and utter bungle. What did the Government say immediately after the referendum when it was attacked in this House about the referendum? The referendum was held, I think, on September 19 last, and on September 23 there was a debate in this House about the result, when the Premier said:

The Labor Party has always said that it will give effect to the vote of the people at the referendum, and the legislation introduced will be in accordance with the wishes of the people.

The Premier said last Wednesday that there was much misrepresentation during the referendum campaign. He referred to the advertisement that appeared, I think, in the *Advertiser* on the day of the referendum, and he said:

The fact is that there was considerable confusion at that poll and they—

that is, the interests concerned, including the union—

went in for a great deal of misrepresentation.

I have had a look at his speech in the following week, and he said not one word in this place about misrepresentation or confusion when discussing the result. All he said was that the Government would give effect to the wishes of the people; not one word was said then, within a week of this so-called representation, about it. He made not one complaint about it. The Government, as we know, went ahead and legislated to close shops not only on Friday night but over the weekend as well. There was, and there continues to be, much resentment in those areas where Friday night shopping existed before the change in the law, and that resentment has caused continuing panic to the member for Mawson, the member for Tea Tree Gully, the member for Playford, and no doubt to many others.

Dr. Tonkin: Let's hear what the member for Playford has to say.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We shall be interested in that.

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one speaker at a time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The perturbation of those members and other Government members, together with developments in New South Wales and Victoria, has been responsible for an about-turn by the Government. The Government knows that if it were to lose those three seats and the seat of Chaffey it would be out of office, and it is doing its best to see that that does not happen. I point out to the Minister of Roads and Transport, who is doing his best to put me off by interjecting (which you are not stopping, Mr. Speaker) that there is now no suggestion of another referendum being held to see what the people want. All we hear from the Premier now is that a real demand exists for Friday night shopping. He does not suggest a referendum now. Government members seem to have forgotten that the Government said it would abide by the people's wishes. If that does not show political opportunism, I do not know what does. I come now to the third point, namely, the

question of the domination of the Government by the trade union movement.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Rattle the old can again!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham, who has the call, is entitled to present his case in a proper manner. Honourable members can answer the debate by entering into it and not by interjecting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I intend to deal with the third point at somewhat greater length but only by going back about five weeks in time, and I challenge the Minister or any Government member to tell me that I am wrong in the chronology I will mention.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That would be easy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will see. I hope that members will do so if they consider they are able to do so. On February 17, the R.T.A. drafted proposals for a roster scheme on the assumption that Friday night shopping would be introduced into South Australia. On February 18, those draft proposals were discussed at a conference attended by Mr. Goldsworthy (whose name has already been mentioned) and Mr. Colman. As a result of that conference, the draft proposals were altered to the satisfaction, it was believed at that time, of all who were present at the conference.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who was present?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was a conference among representatives of the R.T.A. and Messrs. Goldsworthy and Colman.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: But who were there?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is not relevant, and I hope the Minister will not persist in trying to put me off.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is a figment of your imagination.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and I ask that the member for Mitcham be shown the utmost courtesy in the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Those points of agreement were embodied in a letter written to Mr. Goldsworthy, signed by Mr. Gavin Macdonald, Secretary of the association, and dated February 22. The first sentence in the letter states:

The council of the Retail Traders Association has considered at length your exemptive's request that certain alterations be made to our recent proposals to you on shopping and working hours as set out in our letter of February 17.

Those were the draft proposals; the letter recites them all. On February 23, the following day, association representatives waited on the Minister for Labour and Industry at 9.30 a.m. The Minister was told that substantial agreement had been reached between the union and the association on the system of working once Friday night shopping was introduced. The Minister, on behalf of the Government, expressed great pleasure that that was so. That pleasure was confirmed later in the day, I understand, at a social gathering. About six days later, on either February 29 or March 1, Caucus agreed to the proposals; that was reported in the *Advertiser*. I will now quote what appears in the *Advertiser* of March 1, which would mean that the meeting was on February 29, although I remember when I mentioned it in passing in the House, that it was denied by the Premier. Under the heading "Friday Night Shopping is Odds On", the *Advertiser* states:

Friday night shopping is an odds-on certainty to be operating soon, probably from about the beginning of May. This is my firm opinion, despite the rejection by the Shop Assistants Union five-day week committee on Monday of a proposal from the Retail Traders Association which has brought the five-day week nearer to accomplishment than any previous plan. This proposal virtually has the Government's blessing (it was reportedly supported in principle by the Labor Caucus yesterday) and retailers reported yesterday when they circulated details to their staffs that they, too, were happy with it.

That was at the beginning of March. Unhappily, on the same night the regular monthly meeting of the union mentioned by the Leader and attended by between 120 and 150 people turned the plan down. That was on the very day, I understand, after Caucus had agreed to it in principle. The result was that on March 3 the plan was rejected by the Trades and Labor Council. A report of this appears in the *Advertiser* of March 4 under the heading "Unions give All-clear on Shopping"—a rather misleading headline, because the unions had given the all-clear but not on the terms approved by the retailers, the Government and Caucus, but on other terms. The *Advertiser* states:

Afterwards the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council said that the meeting had decided to support the Government's policy on shopping hours of amending the Industrial Code to provide a five-day 40-hour week from Monday and Friday and finishing at 5.30 p.m. on Friday, for employees in the retail trade It included the rejection of a two-week roster plan endorsed by the Retail Traders Association.

That was the position on March 3. On March 8, Caucus capitulated, changing the decision that had been made earlier, despite (and I say this deliberately) the pleas made by the Premier and other Ministers.

Mr. Langley: Utter rubbish!

Mr. Crimes: You know that's wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know that; I believe it is right. This, too, was reported in the newspaper, under the heading "Shop Hours Switch by Labor", as follows:

The South Australian Labor Caucus is believed to have decided yesterday to support the late shopping plan drawn up by a meeting of 18 trade unions six days ago. Yesterday's Caucus decision caused no surprise in trade union circles.

They know that Caucus must toe the line when the Trades and Labor Council demands it. That was the position until about a fortnight ago. On March 10, Myers held a ballot on the question of—

Mr. Slater: It was held under coercion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not believe that. The conditions under which it was held have been explained to me in detail, and I reject the statement that it was not entirely fair. It was run by the employees themselves and there was absolutely no coercion. The result members opposite know to their discomfort.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. I will not continually rise to my feet calling honourable members to order. The honourable member for Mitcham, who has the call, is entitled to be heard with courtesy. If they have anything to say, honourable members can say it when their turn comes to speak in the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The ballot resulted in about a six-to-one majority in favour of the roster plan and against the plan proposed by the Government. On March 11, the *Advertiser* contained not a pronouncement by the Minister or the Premier but a pronouncement by Mr. Teddy Goldsworthy about what would happen to the legislation. The article, which is headed "Shop Hours Ballot 'Has No Effect'—Union Chief", states:

The result of yesterday's secret ballot of Myers staff would have "no effect whatever on the shopping hours legislation," the Branch Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union (Mr. E. J. Goldsworthy) said last night.

He does not say that it will have no effect on the policy of the union, and he does not say what he thinks should happen: he comments

on what the Government intends. Here we get to what I believe is the lowest point of all, when the trade union Secretary says publicly what the Government will do. Not the Minister or even a jolly backbencher but the trade union Secretary, who is not a Parliamentarian at all, gets the headline in the newspaper and says what effect (or non-effect) the ballot will have.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: No wonder your clients are all in gaol.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not continually rise to my feet to call honourable members to order for interjections.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you name him?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River knows very well that he is out of order in interjecting while I am on my feet. If honourable members on both sides co-operate, we can conduct proceedings a little more respectably.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although I appreciate your protection, Sir, each time you get up to speak I lose some of the time I have to speak; I hope this will not happen again. The *Advertiser* report of March 11 also states:

Myers Managing Director (Mr. B. Glowrey), who announced the poll result, said it had vindicated the opinion held by Myers management, which was close to its staff and knew what its preference was. "We hope—

and I hope members opposite will take note of the next part of the article—

it will strengthen the hand of the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry, who were advocating our scheme, to cause the Trades and Labor Council to change its attitude."

Not only I have suggested that the Premier and the Minister were against the Trades and Labor Council's scheme: Mr. Glowrey, who, according to the Premier, has had continuing and close consultation with the Government, has also said so publicly in the newspaper.

That is the chronology of the matter over the few weeks before the Bill was introduced. The Premier said that the Government had decided to explore every avenue to see how late night shopping could be achieved at a minimum cost to the public and, at the same time, protect the rights of the workers in the shopping industry. He added that unfortunately it had not been possible to reach agreement. He said this had occurred because the Government had decided that workers in the retail trade were entitled to a five-day 40-hour week like everyone else and, because, like everyone else, they were also entitled to be

paid extra when their hours were widely spread or when they worked overtime.

Mr. Wright: Do you agree with that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me develop the point in my own way. I have given this as background. If the honourable member listens, he will find out whether I agree.

Mr. Clark: It will be the truth, won't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: And to the point as well. One wonders why the union and the Trades and Labor Council have taken the stand they have taken and have forced it on the Government. Several reasons have been advanced for this, and I cannot vouch for any of them. One is that, as Mr. Goldsworthy is up for re-election in August this year, he must do something to justify his position and secure it in the union. Another reason suggested, which is perhaps more significant, is that the objective of the Trades and Labor Council (I believe this to be so, although members opposite may deny it if I am wrong) is a 35-hour week, and a 35-hour week will be more difficult to achieve, certainly in the shopping industry, if the roster system is accepted. Another reason suggested which perhaps will not appeal to members opposite is that those Government members who are keen trade unionists have espoused this course with the aim of weakening the position of the Premier in his own Party. I do not know which, if any, of these is the true reason, but there must be some reason why the Party opposite has deliberately gone against what is obviously the wish of the majority of those concerned, and has espoused a system which will undoubtedly mean a greater cost to the consumer, in exchange for Friday evening shopping, than the roster system would do.

Let us now think a little about the competing plans that have been put forward for the working of the Friday shopping hours. We have the roster system put forward by the retail traders. There is the scheme embodied in the legislation before us. We now have a third variation being advanced by, I think, Woolworths (S.A.) Limited, but certainly by what are called, in the stop press of one edition of today's *News*, the food chains. In my view, it is not the role of Parliament to decide which, if any, of these schemes should be implemented. That is a matter in this industry, as it is in every other industry in South Australia, for the Industrial Court. That is the position, and this Parliament has no business at all in legislating for these matters.

Mr. Langley: They don't have to open if they don't want to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I beg the honourable member's pardon.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is my view and, before I compare the costs involved in the two schemes, may I revert to the motives of the Shop Assistants Union and of Mr. Goldsworthy, with which I meant to deal earlier. On March 14, Mr. Goldsworthy issued a circular, in which he said:

Under the roster system, there is no encouragement for finally obtaining a real five-day week with no trading on Saturday. The provisions of the roster provide for payment at single time only for work performed on Saturday—an ideal set-up for the retailers. The union proposal calls for overtime at time and a half for Saturday work, and under this system the employers will almost certainly be looking at the position of Saturday trading.

In other words, he hopes to make it so tough for the retailers that they will not want or will not be able to stay open on Friday evening and Saturday morning. He made this very clear in his debate with Mr. Glowrey on channel 9 on Friday evening. I have a transcript of part of what he said then, a portion of which is as follows:

I don't deny, in fact, I accept the full responsibility of saying that my organization is totally committed to the eventual abolition of Saturday trading, and I believe that the only way, as my circular indicates, that there is any possibility of such an event taking place is by making the penalties for working on Friday and Saturday at least realistic.

That is a euphemism, I suggest, for saying that the penalties will be so heavy as to be impossible for the retailers to bear. That is a fourth alternative reason why the union and the Trades and Labor Council have imposed this system on the Government. I have had calculations made that show that the wages increase under the Government scheme will be about 20 per cent, and, if any honourable member wants me to, I can go through the arithmetic. I have also had calculations made to show—

Mr. Harrison: If you've got them there, give them to us.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, these are the figures which, perhaps, honourable members will follow. It will involve 40 hours work from Monday to Friday until 5.30 p.m. On Friday evening three hours will be worked at time and a half, amounting to 4.5 hours,

making a total of 44.5 hours. On Saturday morning, three hours will be worked at time and a half, making a total of 4.5 hours. However, only 75 per cent of current trading will result if Victoria's experience is followed here. Therefore, those 4.5 hours can be reduced to 3.375 hours extra, for which employees will have to be paid. That makes a total of 47.875 hours, for which an employee will have to be paid, taking into account time and a half for Friday evening and Saturday morning work. The current proposal involves 40.75 hours work, because a 25 per cent loading is offered already for Friday evening work. Therefore, the increase is 7.125 hours.

Mr. McRae: You have missed the Saturday morning loading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is a 25 per cent loading for three hours on Saturday morning.

Mr. Brown: Which is already on.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I have missed that, it will mean that my calculations are slightly out.

Mr. Clark: Like your whole argument.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's just like you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: However, it will not make very much difference to the final result, which I worked out as being 7.125 hours over the 40-hour week, an increase of nearly 20 per cent. Under the scheme put forward by the retailers, the increase is about 10 per cent. It can be worked out in the same way, although I am unwilling to do so now because time is getting short. However, I will do so if any honourable member wants me to.

Mr. McRae: I would like you to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Normally, staff would receive the same pay as they do now and, conceding the 25 per cent loading for three hours work on Friday evening, it would amount to 40.75 hours. Replacements for Mondays will involve half the staff, which amounts to four hours, but, as only 90 per cent trading is experienced on Monday, that four hours is reduced to 3.36 hours. The Saturday replacement of three hours must be again halved, as half the staff will be off. It therefore amounts to 1.5 hours, but, because only 75 per cent trading is expected on Saturday mornings, the total is reduced to .75 hours extra. Therefore, the extra over the 40.75 hours is 4.11 hours, which is, according to my calculations, an increase of just over 10 per cent. This therefore means that the increase in cost under the roster

system is a little more than half of the increase in cost of wages under the Government scheme. That can be converted, and I can again give an example of the calculations of the cost to the customer. It has been calculated that under the scheme it will add about 5 per cent to the retail price of an article and, therefore, under the retailers' scheme, about a 2½ per cent increase, which is a significant difference in the cost to the customer.

It is my strong view that these are not matters that can possibly be decided properly in this place: they are matters that should be decided in the Industrial Commission, and it is absolutely and entirely wrong for us to legislate, as we intend to do in clause 5, for the ordinary hours of work and the hours of overtime that must be worked. It is not done, so far as I know (as I have said earlier), for any other industry. Why, then, should it be done for this industry? The Premier said (and I think I may have quoted this previously) the following:

This has occurred because the Government has decided that workers in the retail trade are entitled to a five-day 40-hour week like everyone else and because like everyone else they are also entitled to be paid extra when their hours are widely spread or when they work overtime.

Well, everyone else has got that through the Industrial Commission. Why then should it not be achieved by shop workers through the Industrial Commission? So far as I know, there can be no answer whatever to that. Therefore, the only reason for the insertion in the Bill of clause 5 is that the Trades and Labor Council is determined for reasons of its own (whatever they may be—whether they are the reasons I have given or are others) to force shop assistants to work the overtime and get more money, rather than to accept the roster system, which will give the employees less money but more leisure time and which, I believe, is the system that is desired by the overwhelming majority of shop assistants. Only a few minutes ago I was handed a copy of a letter addressed to the Premier from the shop assistants at Arndale. It is in these terms:

At a meeting of the shop assistants held at the Arndale store on the 20th (yesterday) it was resolved to (1) approach the Premier and point out that we, the Arndale shop-workers, at that meeting rejected the Government's proposed legislation.

It goes on to state a number of other points, the fifth one of which is:

If the Government persists in introducing extended trading hours, it is our firm belief that the welfare and living conditions of the workers in our industry will best be served by the R.T.A. rostered system.

Do honourable members opposite or the Minister say that that meeting was influenced by the bosses? I cannot hear anything to that effect from members opposite. It is too absurd to suggest that the shop assistants have, in expressing their views, been influenced by the bosses. They are intelligent and capable enough to make up their own minds and to weigh up the advantages and disadvantages of each system.

A roster system has been adopted in other industries. An 80-hour fortnight is worked by the Police Force under their award under conditions similar to these. If it has been done there, why not draw up a similar award through the Industrial Commission for shop assistants? There is no reason whatever why that should not be done. Parliament is not in a position to judge how it should be laid down. It is quite wrong for this Parliament to try to insert in this Act of Parliament by this amendment to the Industrial Code matters which are properly matters for the commission, which this Parliament has set up to do just this.

There is only one other matter I mention briefly—butcher shops. Under the Bill, butcher shops are to remain closed on Friday nights and their hours are to remain the same as at present. I know the butchering industry is distinct from other types of shop, but I cannot for the life of me see why if people are going to a supermarket to buy their goods on a Friday night they should not be able to buy their meat as well. There is no logical argument against that and I propose at the appropriate time to say something more about it.

Of course, I support the second reading of this Bill because I have said on many occasions before that I favour extended shopping hours, but I believe that the Government has made a bungle of the whole thing, that it has shown absolute opportunism politically in the way it has handled the matter, that it is completely under the domination of the trade unions and that, when there is a choice between the interests dictated by the trade unions and the interests of the public, those of the trade unions prevail. I hope the lessons we learn from this Bill will not be lost on the people of South Australia.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the Bill. Before attempting an analysis of the

situation, I want to begin by drawing to the attention of the House the true meaning of clause 5. I was hoping that the Leader of the Opposition would have the Bill in front of him while I am dealing with this because I do not think that he or other members opposite have so far understood the point at issue. However, I see that he has not the Bill in front of him, so I will go on to some other points that I was going to make.

The general philosophies I have consistently followed in the speeches I have made in this House are these: I believe that in the area I represent shops should open on Friday night; that in making that decision the Government should have regard to the interests of the community, the employers and the employees, and should attempt to balance those interests. I have said so consistently since this matter was first raised before the referendum, during the period of debate in this House leading to the referendum and again after the referendum; I have said it after attacks from all sorts of groups, and I continue to say it. I recall that, when I spoke on the second occasion about this matter, I appended to the end of my speech this observation that, if the shops were to open on Friday nights, it should not be at the expense of the proper working conditions of shop assistants and a 40-hour week and proper overtime rates should be provided.

I believe that uniformity of hours is essential. Under the old system the district that I represent had an advantage over other districts in this city. That is an advantage that was not logically maintainable. Now that advantage is not retained but I believe that uniformity is a good thing. I was about to deal with clause 5. I see that the Leader of the Opposition has still not the Bill in front of him so I gather he is not interested in what I have to say on this, but I will press on. I think that consistency is essential in this matter. I have been consistent in seeking to exclude retail butchers; I have been consistent in seeking that that should apply to all areas, not giving special benefits to Elizabeth and Salisbury; and I have been consistent in demanding proper provision for employees by way of a 40-hour week with other benefits in the way of penalties.

I find it regrettable that those who in 1970 pressed so hard for this principle now retract. I must refer to the position of the corporations of Salisbury and Elizabeth and of the situation of the retail traders at Elizabeth. What a lamentable position it is! Members will recall

that a meeting was held in the Octagon Theatre where I, the member for Elizabeth, and the member for Tea Tree Gully were put on display before about 1,000 people, and we were badgered and badgered. A demand was made of us that we break our pledge to support the majority decision of Caucus and support late night shopping in this area. I said in this House that I believed that Mr. Duffield, who was leading in proposing that motion, was genuine, although I now find that that is far from being the case. I have in front of me a document showing that his behaviour then was blatant political opportunism. References were made by my other colleagues to other people in local government, and at the time I thought those references were far too harsh, but I now know what a piece of blatant political opportunism it was.

What happened was that, when it was in the interests of Mr. Duffield (who was the Mayor of Elizabeth and also the L.C.L. candidate for Playford) to demand late night shopping as a way of embarrassing the local members, he did so; but, now that the Government is in a position to legislate for Friday night shopping, we find a complete about-turn on his part. Last Thursday morning I sent a telegram to each and every councillor of Salisbury and Elizabeth corporations seeking their attendance here today, not only to take part as spectators but also to join me in leading a deputation to the Midland members of the Legislative Council. Altogether, 38 telegrams were sent but only one person came. Did the Mayor of Salisbury or the Mayor of Elizabeth come? No, they did not. They are exposed as blatant political opportunists and I am not prepared to enter into official communication with them again. They are exposed for what they are. I am sorry that on the previous occasion I was far too kind to them, and I will make a point of exposing them to the people in the district. The situation is clear: no-one, including any member of the Opposition, denies that the public wants Friday night shopping. The question is now limited to the surrounding machinery. If the Leader of the Opposition will not give me the courtesy of listening to this, I put it to other members on his side in the hope that they will consider the matter.

Clause 5 has been misunderstood by every speaker. It is necessary to read clause 5 in the light of the industrial law cases that preceded it. In 100 cases around the Commonwealth, as the member for Florey said, the Shop Assistants Union has been told by

courts and Industrial Commissions that, when Governments lay down hours of trading, they also lay down hours of ordinary work, and the commissions are not willing to grant overtime during those hours. In our own State, one can find verification of this in cases before the South Australian Industrial Commission. I think I have a pointless task, for no-one on the Opposition side will even attempt to research the matter. I think members opposite are prepared to be the minions of the retail traders and to accept whatever is put up. In case there is one member opposite who may care to research the matter, I suggest he look at the South Australian Industrial Reports, 1948, volume 22, at page 54, where Mr. President Morgan deals with this point; and also at the Shop Board Determination (Saturday Morning Rates Case) in South Australian Industrial Reports, 1964-65, volume 31, where Mr. President Williams, as he then was, makes the same point.

The point that seems to have escaped everyone is this: by clause 5, all that is being done is to remedy an existing evil, the evil being that the Industrial Commission cannot do for this group of people what it would otherwise do. Surely the proposition cannot be put more simply than that. Industrial Commissions throughout the Commonwealth have reached the situation where they would like to give the shop assistants the same 5-day week (the same 40-hour week) as applies in every other comparable industry, but they are prevented from doing so by the nature of the legislation. That is the key factor in clause 5, but no-one on the Opposition benches seems to appreciate that or seems even to want to appreciate it. However, for anyone who cares to read *Hansard*, that may be some guide to the true meaning that lies behind clause 5.

In addition to a careful scrutiny of clause 5, it is absolutely essential that members carefully scrutinize the award, but they obviously have not done this, because there is nothing in clause 5 to state what the quantum of penalty rates will be. In a moment I shall expose the utter falsity of the ludicrous figures fed to the member for Mitcham by the Retail Traders Association (figures either ill prepared by the association or ill digested by the honourable member). I must request that any fair-minded person, if he is going to consider this problem objectively to read the award as well, because it is quite possible within the terms of clause 5 to provide a tremendous

degree of flexibility for retail traders (that is, a flexibility that will prevent what they claim will mean an extraordinary escalation of costs).

I believe that, either through stubbornness or a determination not even to try to understand the clauses of the Bill in conjunction with the award, the retail traders are putting a false picture to the public; they are giving the public the impression that the iron heel of the Government is stamping down on them an inflexible system that they cannot alter, yet they can alter it within the very terms of the award; they are frauds to suggest anything else and to make the statement that they have made to the papers. Any lawyer of any experience at all in the field would tell them that. How well the member for Florey explained the matter concerning wage rates when he said that the rate for an adult male shop assistant (\$55.20) compares far less than favourably with the rates applying in any other major industry in this State. Indeed, we are dealing with a major industry: on the latest figures the total number of persons involved in the retail trade in South Australia is 51,444.

No other single employing group, with the exception of the State Government, can anywhere near match that figure. Therefore, we have a major industrial group, for which the association has the effrontery to suggest a wage rate of \$55.20 is in any sense reasonable. I had the honour to represent the Shop Assistants Union on numerous occasions in various matters, and I have also had the pleasure of meeting with some members of the Retail Traders Association and the discomfort of meeting with some of the conservative vanguard of that organization, although I have no query with its industrial officers or its secretary. However, I point out that a clerk receives \$57 a week; a Ministerial chauffeur \$60 a week; a stockman at the abattoirs \$64 a week; a presser in the clothing trades industry \$52.40 a week; a bread-carter \$57.90 a week; a clerk in hotels \$58.40 a week; a builder's labourer in excess of \$59 a week; and all tradesmen receive well in excess of \$70 a week.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford.

Mr. McRAE: In addition, in most similar industries equal pay is now applied, but does the Retail Traders Association point out to the public that historically it has been the meanest, lousiest employer in the South Australian field? Does it point out to the public that it has not attempted to provide equal pay for female

employees? Does it point to the rotten exploitation of some of its members (juveniles and females) in its shops? No, it points out none of these things. It points out what suits it; and what a joke it is, in the light of that, to read its advertisement in the paper. Bearing in mind that the male assistant's rate is \$55.20, I point out that the female rate is even less (\$43.10), and that is a joke. A woman employee on the bottling line in an aerated water factory receives \$48.85, and what does she do? She picks up bottles on the line and sticks them in crates, or holds a bottle up to the light to see whether there is a chip in it.

A female presser in the clothing trades industry receives \$52.40, and a barmaid, who in many respects has duties similar to those of a shop assistant, receives \$54.70. The retail traders have the accursed effrontery to tell the House, through their minions here, and to tell the public through their crook advertisements, that their industry can claim to be a dignified and honest industry but, along with the member for Florey, I am disgusted with them. I cannot equal the eloquence or the volume of the member for Florey, but I do agree with his sentiments.

I now refer to the breakdown of males and females in the industry and the number of juveniles employed, lest any member remain unaware of what is the true situation. The annual report of the Labor and Industry Department for 1970 (readily available as a Parliamentary Paper) discloses the total employees engaged in shops at that time, before shopping districts were changed, to be 43,373. There were 14,000 male adult employees, 18,984 female adult employees and the percentages disclosed 63 per cent females and 37 per cent males. Of the total, 25 per cent were juniors and of that number a large portion comprised junior females. I suggest that here is a most profitable industry, as the member for Florey pointed out, because of the sweating of its employees by means of its mean industrial negotiations. It knows that 65 per cent of the employees will get \$43.10 (what a joke—\$43.10) and it has no intention of making any move towards equal pay or anything like it. Additionally, a sizeable number of female employees (precisely 5,876) of the total number of employees at that stage (43,000, or near enough to one-seventh) received junior rates.

I once had the unpleasant experience of working in one of these retail stores. I worked for Coles and Co Limited and I was sickened by the exploitation of the junior female staff. I have no sympathy for the Retail Traders

Association in view of its industrial policies over the years, or for anyone, including the Deputy Leader, who can stand up, as he stood up, and sneer at Teddy Goldsworthy. Indeed, he did not even give him the courtesy of his title: he merely sneered at Teddy Goldsworthy for what he did. Yet the Retail Traders Association is guilty of this glaring industrial disease that today is nothing short of ridiculous. The Leader and the Deputy Leader have walked out, clearly not having understood clause 5 of the Bill. In fact, when I tried in a rational manner to explain the clause to them, they were, to say the least, discourteous. Yet they are the very people who so often claim that we on this side of the House are discourteous. They do not understand the clause and they do not want to understand it because, if they did, they would have all sorts of problems in putting their message across to the people. This situation is disgraceful, just as it is disgraceful for the Retail Traders Association to suggest that the wage increases could be about 23 per cent. That figure is absurd. The true percentage increase in total wage rates, assuming that each employee worked every Friday and on alternate Saturday mornings, would be about 13 per cent. That is a vast difference—23 per cent compared to 13 per cent.

Because of the flexibility supplied by this clause, but misunderstood by the Opposition, it is not necessary for employees to work on every Friday evening and on every alternate Saturday morning. However, if an employee worked on alternate Friday evenings and on alternate Saturday mornings, the overall wage increase would be more like 9 per cent. Further, by using the other provisions of the award, the overall wage increase for each employee could be further reduced. The association suggests a 23 per cent increase, and I challenged the member for Mitcham to give me his calculations, but he could not give them because his calculations were hopelessly out. Indeed, I have no idea from whence he got them. The true position is that the overall wage increase, when full and complete advantage of the Government's proposition is taken, is 13 per cent and not 23 per cent, and this is a great difference. If the flexibility of the Government's proposition is fully utilized, the total wage increase would be more like 9 per cent.

The Myer Emporium works on a mark-up principle, as do other retail stores, and it works in the way I shall now outline. To produce the total gross profit, 13 per cent is

allocated to wages. In the case of other stores, the percentage varies from 9 per cent down to 5 per cent, as in the case of supermarkets. For the purpose of this example I will work from the highest calculations (10 per cent), assuming that the employers are stupid enough not to take advantage of the flexibility contained in the Government's proposal. If we take wage quantum allocated by Myers as being the highest (as indeed it is), it is impossible to justify a cost increase of more than 1 per cent or 2 per cent in any circumstances. Regarding anyone but Myers, where wages as a part of gross outlay comprise about 9 per cent, 8 per cent, 7 per cent, and even as low as 5 per cent, how can any increase in price be justified?

I will not go into the area canvassed by the member for Florey, who showed members the extraordinary profits made by these companies. Like him, I believe that for many years the Australian public has been taken for a ride by retail traders. We have been robbed blind and my recent experiences in purchasing electrical goods have demonstrated the truth of this statement. The Commonwealth Government has allowed the price maintenance arrangements between the retail stores, the manufacturers and others to flourish and an article that is originally produced for about \$140 may be sold for about \$350. A person can go to Rundle Street today and ask what is the selling price of a refrigerator and he will not be told the price. A price tag will state a price but, if a person inquires whether that is the price at which the goods are to be sold, he will be told it is not. The price will depend on the agreement with certain manufacturers and on whether the purchaser has a certain trade-in; or, if he can arrange for a deal elsewhere, the price will fall. Whatever price is chosen, the retail price maintenance agreement ensures that the retail trader gets the highest profit margin.

It is about time that the community at large in this country was protected from the ravages of these industrial pirates. These are the people who have the effrontery to attack Mr. Goldsworthy who, I add by way of correction, is not a member of the Trades and Labor Council but Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union, and a member of the State Executive of the A.L.P. It is extraordinary that these industrial pirates turn around and attack Mr. Goldsworthy; it is sheer humbug and effrontery. It is time that every Australian demanded a proper commission of inquiry into the robbery of the public. When

Friday evening shopping ceased in Elizabeth, prices did not fall. That is a very interesting point because, if Mr. Glowrey and his team were correct, one would expect that in all honesty they would have reduced prices at Elizabeth. However, that did not happen, and the same old prices still continue. That does not surprise me. That is what I expected, because we have been robbed blind for so long. The whole of the Australian community until recently has accepted the fact that it will not get decent or honest dealings in the retail trade.

Now we have reference to the wishes of the employees. What an extraordinary situation we have seen in this debate. One of my constituents rang me today. I identified myself, but I will refrain from giving her name for her own protection. I was utterly disgusted. The young lady said, "I wish to ask you to register my support for the roster system." I said, "By whom are you employed?" She said, "Myers." I said, "Who is paying for this call?" She said, "Myers." I said, "Are you making this call at your own request or at the request of someone else?" She said, "I am making it at the request of a supervisor." I said, "Did the supervisor make the request to you individually, or did he make it to you in the presence of some other persons?" She said, "He made it in the presence of some other persons." I said, "What did he say?" He said to us, "There's a telephone up there and you can use it free of charge. You are to ring your members of Parliament and tell them that you support the retail traders." I said, "Obviously, Miss, you are in a position of considerable embarrassment. I will merely register what you have said and allow the matter to rest there." She said, "Thank you very much," because obviously if I had carried the conversation further and identified her and the supervisor I could have made a bad splash, and I would have loved to go to Myers, find out who the supervisor was, and question him on what he had said. That is a nice sort of industrial dispute, when one can enter into the affairs of the union and to tell the employees what they are to do. These are the people who, although they say we should be referring this matter to the Industrial Commission (which, by the way, we are), have the audacity to blackmail one of my constituents.

If the father or husband of one of my constituents comes to me with the same story, I shall suggest to Mr. Goldsworthy that appropriate action be taken against this organization for industrial blackmail. What would

members opposite say, if, for instance, Mr. Goldsworthy decided to hold a ballot—

Members interjecting:

Mr. McRAE: —on the views of his members concerning a matter directly affecting the Retail Traders Association? There would be a tremendous uproar. What if Mr. Goldsworthy said (not that he would be able to do it with salaries as they are, because the union does not have as much money as the Myer organization has), “We are going to support Mr. Glowrey. We have an advertisement in the paper. We want you to pick up the phone and tell the association’s members, ‘I support Mr. Glowrey.’” What would the association say about that? It would die with its leg in the air. Yet representatives of the association have done exactly the same thing, and they expect members to swallow it. What is more, they expect members of the public to swallow it. Up to the present, I am horrified to say that some members of the public are swallowing it.

I hope that, as a result of what the member for Florey and I have said, a few people will wake up to the blackmail that is going on. Talk about a genuine ballot! It is the worst rigged stand-over ballot since the commie days in the trade unions of the 1940’s. Then we heard the Deputy Leader, in a joyous moment, say that there was no intimidation because the employees themselves would object. There was a slight, gentle stick. “Just remember,” said Mr. Glowrey “if you don’t vote my way, 200 will get the sack.” What a great start to a democratic ballot! When I consider the very generous, fair and democratic members of the association and the very nasty things they have said against Mr. Goldsworthy, frankly it makes me sick. When I think of their record of intimidation and exploitation in varying degrees and of their effrontery in talking about the union’s stand-over tactics, it makes me doubly sick.

As the situation has been adequately outlined, I wish only to highlight the hypocritical remarks made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Having started off by saying that the Government had changed its tune, he forgot that he made the following statement on October 27:

The point I make is that we must act in the situation in which we find ourselves, and we believe the only thing to do is allow trading on Friday nights to continue in those areas in which it has been permissible and which showed such a strong preference for it at the referendum. I believe (I think the Leader has said this, too) that the final solution, the only

proper solution in the long run, is to allow 9 o’clock trading uniformly, at least throughout the metropolitan area as defined in the Bill.

Yet now we have the Deputy Leader trying to persuade us that he has been consistent throughout.

In summary, my position is that everyone is agreed on Friday night shopping; the only question in dispute concerns the machinery. If members, including the Leader, would read clause 5, with the help I have tried to give this evening, and if they understood it, they would see that the Government had indeed provided the solutions to most of the problems. The solutions to the problems are provided in clause 5 and can be dealt with in the normal process of industrial arbitration. I support the second reading.

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): I have listened to the remarks made by my friend the member for Florey (the sweet flower from Florey) in his usual dulcet tone, and I wondered in what capacity he was speaking: whether as the member for Florey on behalf of his constituents or as President of the Trades and Labor Council. I could not make up my mind. I was in doubt, because I thought that every member was here to speak on behalf of his constituents. I shall speak on behalf of everyone in my district, whether they voted for or against me; that is what I have been elected for. All we seemed to get from the member for Florey was a torrent of abuse. When boiled down, his remarks made little or no contribution to the debate.

We had the delightful episode provided by the member for Playford. First, his speech was nothing but an apologia to justify his position in his own very shaky district. He proceeded to blacken the character of several prominent citizens in his district. In my view, both these speakers launched a vindictive vendetta against the Retail Traders Association in the lowest possible language they could use—terms that would be repugnant to me and to respectable people in the business world of today. The member for Playford devoted much of his speech to arguing a wage case. He referred to the wage rates paid to males and females in this industry. What he was careful not to say was that the matter of wage rates was taken to arbitration, and formally placed in the award referred to. The honourable member also did not say that this was agreed to by the union, outside the Industrial Commission. It was further agreed that the union (and Mr. Goldsworthy, whom I know well, can vouch for

this) would not lodge any further application for increases until later this year. Therefore, much of what the member for Playford said did not apply to this Bill, but I intend to direct my remarks to the Bill.

I believe that this legislation has been introduced by a vacillating and dominated Government whose creditability is now in question, and I will elaborate on this later. In giving his second reading explanation last week, the first thing the Minister said was as follows:

It seems hardly necessary for me to explain this Bill.

He though it was hardly worth explaining. He seemed to be having some difficulty in reading his prepared speech. It was almost as though his heart was not in it—almost as though the complexities of the recent negotiations and instructions might have been a little beyond him. He said that the previous Government had done nothing on the subject. That is completely false, as the Minister well knows.

I intend to put this matter right by referring to some passages from *Hansard*. During my absence from the House late in 1969, the Acting Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. Millhouse) introduced the Early Closing Act Amendment Bill to provide for exemptions in the list of exempted shops and goods. This was an interim measure. The Acting Minister also said that, as it was late in the session, the Government believed that an immediate improvement should be made in this area and that in the following session further measures should be introduced. Members can check this in *Hansard*. When I returned to the House the following session, I said that I was concerned about weekend trading, as trading was being taken away from the legitimate traders who had to work normal hours. In supporting the Early Closing Act Amendment Bill in 1969, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) said:

If we open up the Early Closing Act within that part of the effective metropolitan area to which it now applies, the result will be a significant increase in costs to the consumer, and there is no way out of that. In addition, traders and workmen alike do not want hours of that kind applicable within the metropolitan area to which the Act now applies. Beyond the areas where late shopping is now operating, particularly Friday night shopping, I do not believe that there is a demand for Friday night shopping in those areas to which the Act does not now apply. There is little demand for extra trading hours outside the areas where these are now in operation. Therefore, I believe that we should try to hold the position generally as it stands: that is, we should not interfere with existing vested interests but allow the situation to go no

further; that we should provide that throughout the State there should normally be a five-and-half day week apart from those specially proclaimed shopping nights agreed on by traders in the area for special purposes; and that we should leave Friday night shopping where it stands in areas in which this is already the practice.

The then Leader went on to say that bakers and butchers should have a 5½-day week. Then we had probably the best speech I have ever heard from the Minister of Roads and Transport. The then member for Edwardstown said, "I support the Bill," and sat down. As members who were in the House at that time know, the Bill then passed the second reading stage. Members should take notice of what was said on that occasion by the two Labor members to whom I have referred. What they said was firm and unequivocal. How they have changed since! We should contrast the views expressed then with what is contained in this Bill. What is in the Bill now is completely different from what the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, advocated in 1969.

In his policy speech in 1970, the Premier said that there would be no extension in Friday night shopping beyond the areas where it then obtained. He can say that he has a mandate for that, but has he a mandate for this Bill? This is another example of the Government's vacillation in this matter. Shortly after taking office in 1970—

Mr. Curren: Talk to the Bill for a change!

Mr. COUMBE: I prefer to speak to the Chair. Having said that it would not provide extended shopping hours, the Government then embarked on the remarkably expensive and unnecessary referendum to which so much reference has been made. Because it was unable to make up its mind and because it did not have the guts to make its own decision, the Government embarked on the referendum. I remember the Minister of Works making a confident prediction of a huge "Yes" majority. However, we all saw the subsequent embarrassment of certain A.L.P. members representing districts in which Friday evening shopping had until then been in force. Therefore, late shopping disappeared from the South Australian scene.

Mr. Curren: That was because Steele Hall advocated—

Mr. COUMBE: We might see the honourable member disappear from the scene before long. Different points of view were advanced by the Leader of the present Government when he was in Opposition and since he has become

Premier, and we now have the Government promoting the idea of Friday evening shopping. Honourable members are entitled to ask why it is doing so. I have not heard one definite statement from the Government regarding its reasons for introducing the Bill. If one examines the second reading explanation of the Bill given by the Minister of Labour and Industry, one will see that he did not mention one reason for its introduction. Not only the members of this House but also members of the public are, therefore, left to speculate on the reasons for the Government's decision. Some of these speculations could be along the following lines: was the Government prodded by people in certain dissatisfied and disillusioned areas, or did it receive desperate representations from A.L.P. members of Parliament whose districts were affected?

Mr. Curren: No.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member's district is one, is it?

Mr. Curren: No, they did not.

Mr. COUMBE: Did residents in areas in which late shopping hours were taken away show their resentment of this arrogant and overriding Government?

Mr. Curren: No.

Mr. COUMBE: That is another surmise that one could make.

Mr. Jennings: Why did Steele Hall resign? That's another one!

Mr. COUMBE: I have often wondered why the honourable member is in this House. In view of all this, one can only surmise at what happened. I believe the Government was panicked into taking the action that it has taken and that it wishes that the shopping hours matter would die. It must wish that this matter could be brushed under the carpet and be forgotten. Having got itself into a real mess in recent weeks as a result of its ham-fisted action, there is no doubt that the Government has got itself deeper into the mire.

Mr. Jennings: What about your gang? What about McMahon, Tasmania and South Australia?

Mr. COUMBE: What about Ross Smith?

Mr. Jennings: It is quite all right.

Mr. COUMBE: According to reports, one day we were going to have a roster system, and the next day we were going to have a union system. All sorts of rumours and statements have been flying about. Many

people were disillusioned with the Minister of Labour and Industry after the Arndale meeting at the Woodville Town Hall.

Mr. Langley: I thought you said you were going to speak to the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE: That is just what I intend to do.

Mr. Jennings: What the hell has it to do with them? There is no Speaker in the public gallery.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Sir, I consider that the language, in interjections or otherwise, should at all times be Parliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members have been asked to maintain silence while members are on their feet, and I ask that that ruling be observed.

Mr. COUMBE: All sorts of rumours have been flying around, and certainly many people are becoming fairly disillusioned with the Government. A number of unions held meetings and then told the Government what it had to do.

Mr. Langley: What did you do?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: I do not mind interjections, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. COUMBE: Then, in a fine show of rhetoric, the Premier says, "We have made a firm decision." However, the Government was echoed off the stage by the Minister of Labour and Industry, who conveniently forgot to say that the matter had already been decided for the Government. Therefore, we have before us tonight this scheme which the Government was told to introduce. Not only is this hypocrisy; it also shows up clearly the domination by certain parties.

Mr. Langley: You did nothing when you were Minister. That was your golden opportunity.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: Thank you. I think the Minister might have heeded some of the things that were done during my term of office. If he had, he might not be in the trouble he is in today. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that this Bill was in terms that the Government considered to be in the best interests of the majority. I ask what is this majority of which the Minister is speaking. Is it the majority of the buying public of South

Australia? Is it the majority of shop assistants? Is it the majority of shopkeepers or retail traders, or is it the majority of the union representatives concerned? I should like now to analyse the Minister's statement a little further; in other words, I want to get to the meat of the matter. The Minister said that the Bill was in terms that the Government considered to be in the best interests of the majority. One could ask: In the interests of the majority of whom is this measure introduced? It has been admitted by Government members that the Bill will increase the cost of goods to the public. No-one denies that. Indeed, it will increase the cost to the public by 4 per cent, if not more.

Mr. Payne: That's a new figure.

Mr. Curren: Who worked that out for you—Mr. Glowrey?

Mr. COURCE: I can work out figures myself, even if the member for Chaffey cannot. Therefore, the cost of living in South Australia will increase under this scheme far more than it will under the roster system, which is the alternative to the Bill now before us which was suggested by the R.T.A. How then can this Bill be said to be in the interests of the majority of the public? Is it in the interests of the majority of shop assistants?

Mr. Brown: Yes.

Mr. COURCE: The great majority of shop assistants to whom I have spoken were not told of the roster system by the Government or their union, and many are most annoyed at this. I refer to the 80-hour fortnight, the increased leisure resulting from a three-day weekend every fortnight, greater opportunity for full-time employment, and greater overtime if sought. These matters were not explained by the Government or to all members of the union concerned. They were certainly not explained to all members working in shops. Who will work on Friday nights and Saturday mornings?

Mr. Payne: The same people as always do—the workers.

Mr. COURCE: We are now to make shop assistants work on Fridays from 8.30 a.m. (not 9 a.m.) until 9 p.m. The reference to 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays is already in the present Act, but we know that most shops remain open only until 11.30 a.m. Why not put 11.30 a.m. into the new Act and allow people to get away, as they do now, to enjoy their sport on Saturday afternoons? Why were the shop assistants not told of the

implications of the Government plan and the advantages of the roster system? Is the Government really interested in the majority of the shop assistants?

Mr. Payne: Yes.

Mr. COURCE: From what I have heard, the majority of the shop assistants are strongly opposed to this Bill, and this includes a number of shop assistants presently employed as casuals. What about the majority of the shopkeepers and the R.T.A.? Under the Government scheme it is estimated that the cost to the shopkeeper could rise by 20 per cent, and possibly more.

Mr. Langley: You said 4 per cent before.

Mr. COURCE: I am now talking about the cost to the shopkeeper, not the cost of the goods. If the member for Unley cannot work out a simple matter of economics like this, he should ask his learned friend from Peake to help him. Obviously, this increase must be passed on to the public. The R.T.A. roster plan would minimize these increased costs, and that is what the public is interested in. Certainly, it is what my wife and the average member of the public is interested in. Also, it would be an advantage both to the shopkeeper and to the buying public. So, what about the majority that the Government is talking about? If the Government is talking about the majority of workers, let me tell the Minister that the Government scheme could easily cost the workers at least a 4 per cent increase in the cost of goods bought in stores, and this will cause the workers direct hardship.

Mr. Payne: Bunkum!

Mr. COURCE: Does the honourable member think that the increases will not be passed on to the workers?

Mr. Payne: Let the management carry them.

Mr. COURCE: The Government is talking about a majority. Is it talking about a majority of the public, of the shop assistants, of the shopkeepers or of the workers? This is the Minister's term, not mine. So there is this farcical position of a Government blandly claiming to speak for the people, blindly bringing in a Bill that will cause the average citizen to suffer hardship and blithely saying it is in the interests of the majority when it knows very well it is not. It has the blatant effrontery to pass this off as a progressive measure for the people of the metropolitan area, whilst all the time it is being prodded from behind—and prodded solidly at that.

The Premier last week was obviously uneasy when answering questions in the House on this matter.

Dr. Tonkin: What happened in the Caucus room?

Mr. CUMBE: I was not present, but he was very fidgety in the House afterwards. He even had to go on a special television programme that had been extensively advertised in the press for several days previously, in an attempt to justify himself and his Government to the people for his action in bringing in this Bill. Do we see the Premier appearing on television with advertisements in the newspaper before he introduces every Bill? The whole credibility of the Premier and the Government is in serious question as a result of their actions. I say advisedly that the Government will rue the day that it introduced this Bill and will regret it for the remainder of its term of office. It has blown hot and cold on this measure, if ever it has. The Government's action will be remembered and held against it by a big section of the public and many of its traditional supporters. What, then, can we do at least to improve this wretched Bill and bring some measures of realism and sanity into it? All we can do is one of two things. Either we can suggest that the Bill be withdrawn and redrafted (and we have seen plenty of that during the present Government's regime) or we can amend it in such a way as at least to make it workable and fair. To amend this shocking Bill to achieve what we want will not be easy, but at least we can go some of the way along the path to ameliorate some of the harsh provisions.

For instance, there is the hour of starting in the morning—8.30. In our major shops today people of all ages working, and some of the female staff are not as young as they used to be. However, they will have to start at 8.30 a.m. Is that fair to the majority? Then there is finishing on Saturday at 12.30 p.m. What sort of a restrictive provision is clause 5? I listened to my learned legal friend from Playford, who had much to say on clause 5. (Is it not amazing that, when a lawyer gives an opinion, other lawyers give a different opinion?) That is how they seem to make their money, and the law courts are full of them. Having listened to the Government's legal luminary for a little while, I suggest that even he might study the Bill a little more closely. I speak as a layman with a little commonsense experience but, thank goodness, I am not a lawyer. Under clause 5, no award

or agreement affecting ordinary hours of work can be changed. Supposing employers and employees agree on a different and improved range of hours: under clause 5, they cannot change the situation.

What would happen if Mr. Goldsworthy, of the Shop Assistants Union, following the introduction of a 35-hour week in other registries, were to negotiate an agreement with the R.T.A. for a different set of hours of work? Under clause 5 he could not do it. Surely, any industrial association has the natural right to approach its appropriate court for a variation in award conditions and hours. That has been the basis of industrial relations in this country, supported by both sides of politics, and it has been fostered and promoted by the Australian Labor Party for many years. Yet by inserting clause 5 this Labor Government is denying that right to an industrial union, and that is one of the harsh provisions of the Bill affecting the workers of this State.

While Government members are obviously committed to Friday night shopping, the R.T.A. plan for a roster system is the only workable proposal that can be considered. It is a worthwhile alternative to the Bill, because in my opinion the existing provisions will create hardship. The association's proposal is a good one and it is acceptable; and, despite the disparaging comments made by members opposite, I sincerely believe that the great majority of shop assistants will welcome this move. Indeed, I should not mind having three days off every other week.

While Government members are committed to their Bill, I ask them to have the courage to speak for their electors, instead of adhering to their dogmatic stand as Party members. I ask them to do this as a member who has crossed the floor on this matter. I was not frightened to cross the floor, and I challenge any Government member to speak on behalf of his electors, instead of speaking merely on behalf of his Party. Members opposite, like members on this side, are elected by their constituents to represent those constituents, and you, Mr. Speaker, when calling on members to speak, call on, say, the member for Adelaide or the member for Glenelg: you do not call on the member representing the A.L.P. or the L.C.L.

I ask Government members to cast back their minds to the vote on the referendum in the districts they represent and to bear in mind how the people in those districts voted. I wonder

why the Government introduced this Bill, which is a wretched measure. Having decided that it would implement Friday night shopping, the Government was stuck with the problem of how to go about it. The Minister said the Government had decided that it would introduce the measure for the majority, but he did not say to which category that majority applied. I have previously outlined the four categories of people involved in this matter, and I believe I have shown that the Government is not legislating for the majority of the people generally. I believe the Bill is a bad measure and that the alternative suggested is the proper measure to be supported.

Mr. BROWN (Whyalla): I wonder whether the member for Torrens is supporting or opposing the Bill! Although my district is not affected by the measure, I claim to know as much as anyone knows about Friday night shopping, for there has been Friday night shopping (and, indeed, Thursday night shopping) in my district for some time. The member for Torrens said that this Bill had been introduced by a dominated Government yet, ironically, everyone but the honourable member has expressed support for the Bill. The honourable member said his Party did something about shopping hours when it was in power, but I question that statement.

I now refer to what the former Leader of the Opposition has said on this question. He advocated seven days a week for shopping, and I ask at what cost? He advocated 24 hours a day for shopping. We have heard throughout this debate that we have to look at the cost angle which, we are told, will be between 20 per cent and 25 per cent, but this is a figure plucked from the air. What would we have been up for had the former Leader had his way? I refer also to what the Deputy Leader said in 1970 in my area and I assume the press report attributed to him to be fair. On both sides of the House this has been a difficult question and I do not believe that members opposite would ever deny this. The Deputy Leader said:

The question of legislation of trading hours was a difficult problem with no ideal solution When we were in the Government we found it a difficult problem.

Had his Party been in Government he would have put the following proposal:

Each day would be divided into thirds, which split a six-day week (excluding Sundays) into 18 parts. Businesses would be able to open for 11 or 12 of the 18 times, making the choice themselves to suit local conditions.

I am running a competition for \$5 for members on this side who can say in 10 minutes what this means. The Deputy Leader continued:

However, preliminary feelers put to the Retail Traders Association in Adelaide had not got a promising reception.

I do not doubt that at all. The member for Torrens then referred to clause 5 and said:

No award or agreement affecting the ordinary hours could be changed under this clause.

What does the honourable member advocate? Is he advocating that we are worrying about a reduction of hours by shop assistants or increasing the hours worked? Throughout the debate on shopping hours, members opposite have sat back and criticized but have done nothing constructive. The member for Bragg can smile, but members opposite have done nothing.

Mr. Mathwin: I voted on the referendum.

Mr. BROWN: I am pleased and I understand you are allowed to vote. I sincerely believe that this Bill, as introduced to this House by this Government, is a simple Bill that provides at least what I consider to be a 40-hour 5-day week for employees in the retail industry, but 20 years after the majority of workers in this country have enjoyed this same privilege.

Mr. Rodda: Did the referendum tell you that?

Mr. BROWN: It seems ironic that, every time a Labor Government or the trade union movement or a trade union representative advocates a shorter working week or a higher wage for the workers or increased annual leave, there is always public outcry that prices will increase.

Mr. Rodda: They won't come down, and you would agree with that.

Mr. BROWN: I believe in the price control system, and I put that for the benefit of the member for Victoria. I believe that retail organizations such as the Myer Emporium and John Martins should be responsible to and should explain to a responsible arbitrator any proposed price increases. There will never be a solution to inflation until that happens.

I now refer to the press statement of Mr. Glowrey, as reported in the *News* of March 10, as follows:

In a 20-minute address to the mass meeting of men and women employees, the managing director of Myer S.A. Stores Ltd., Mr. B. Glowrey, warned that thousands of retail workers would be sacked if the union proposals on extended shopping hours were introduced by the Government.

First, how many thousands of employees will be affected? Secondly, the proposals of this Bill provide nothing new, because Friday night shopping has been going on in this State for a long time.

Mr. Gunn: Until you stopped it.

Mr. BROWN: This Bill does not introduce a price increase because of Friday night shopping. Until recently, as honourable members opposite have reminded us, Friday night shopping occurred in this State, but I ask what rate of pay did traders pay? Did they pay ordinary rates or did the young people employed work for free? I draw the attention of members opposite to the award provisions in clause 10, overtime rates, which provides:

Subject to the provisions of this award relating to Sundays and public holidays for all time worked outside of or in excess of the daily or weekly hours prescribed in clause 7 of this award, or times prescribed by this award, shall be overtime and be paid for at the rate of time and a half.

In fact, time and a half must have been paid on Friday nights, unless the traders were violating the award. It is also ironic that that clause provides:

Provided that when the Early Closing Act is suspended to permit a late trading night during the week prior to Christmas employees who work beyond 5.30 p.m. shall be paid at the rate of time and three-quarters for such time worked.

Had the award been complied with I doubt that we need have argued the point about Friday night shopping. Mr. Glowrey wants only to pay the award rate current when shops were open in Elizabeth and Salisbury and other late night shopping areas. What humbug we have heard about Friday night shopping. Saturday morning shopping is also dealt with in the award and, by agreement between the traders, hours of work between 9 a.m. and 11.30 a.m. are covered. This Bill allows for the hours between 8.30 a.m. and 12.30 p.m., and it has never been altered. The Minister is correct in his interjection. It has never been altered. Saturday morning work has always been paid at time and a quarter. Even on the basis of Saturday morning work at time and a half, it has not been agreed to because, as I understand the situation, it will be referred to arbitration. Time and a quarter was paid. If the arbitration tribunal decides on time and a half, it will be only a 25 per cent increase for 2½ hours. Yet the Opposition is raving about increases of 20 per cent and 25 per cent, and we will get up to 30 per cent if we are not careful, but based on what

figures? Let us examine the shop assistants' award. The ordinary shop assistant receives \$55.20 a week, which, on a 40-hour week, would be about \$1.38 an hour. Saturday morning for 2½ hours at time and a quarter would be about \$1.725, and it would cost Myers about \$4.31 now. Even if the court says that the 2½ hours will be at time and a half, which would be about \$2.07 an hour, it would cost only about \$5.17. Where is the great increase? If I asked Mr. Glowrey for a couple of dollars, I wonder whether he would have it! I guess that the member for Rocky River would have it.

Another complication exists in the award because, with the change of hours and Saturday morning starting at 8.30 the 2½ hours on Saturday morning at time and a quarter would become single time for five days, and the time and a half, if passed by the court, would operate. Even on the basis of \$55.20 a week of five days and Saturday morning work at \$5.70, it would still bring the shop assistant's rate to only \$60.37. As has been pointed out, this is not such a large increase to Myers and others. When some of the retailers in my area decided to open on Thursday night, time and a half was paid. The Retail Traders Association, which is so adamant on the question of a five-day week of 40 hours, is paying time and a half for an extra day in my area.

Regarding the history of the matter, we are not being proper when we do not consider what happened regarding Friday night shopping. The Playford Government had an Early Closing Act which covered the metropolitan area, and I think that everyone agrees with that. As the outer metropolitan area developed and as cities such as Whyalla developed, they were outside the Act passed by the Playford Government. This meant that they could open but they were governed by the award laid down. There is no doubt in my mind about this. The problem of trying to come to a suitable solution of the shopping hours problem is that the retail traders cannot agree, and they still cannot agree in my area. Merely because shops open for a 40-hour week and also on Friday night there should not be an increase in prices. Despite opening in my area on Friday night, not many months ago both Coles and Woolworths advertised price reductions.

Many members are saying that because we are talking about Friday nights and working time and a half there will be a 25 per cent increase in consumer prices, but in Whyalla we

are opening on Thursday night, and with reductions in some prices. I do not know where the 20 per cent to 25 per cent increase in retail prices comes from. Regarding the question of retail traders, particularly in my area, in the District of Tea Tree Gully, the Salisbury District and the Playford District, I am sure that these things happen.

Mr. Mathwin: They had an advantage over you: they had a referendum.

Mr. BROWN: We call a man in my area "Mr. 5 per cent" because everything he sells is supposed to be at a 5 per cent reduction. He was the first business man in my area to open on Friday night. He opened on Friday night because he had a supermarket centred in a heavily populated area. He knew that he had the possibility of capturing the consumer market. He opened up at night to make a dollar. When I approached him I found that the supermarket was run by a self-service arrangement in which he, his wife, his brother and his brother's wife were the sole overhead involved. Not one cent was paid out in wages. The problem with the Retail Traders Association is that some can trade with no overhead whereas some must trade with large overhead. But they are still making a profit. "Mr. 5 per cent" now opens on Thursday night, too. I also pointed out to him at that time that, if he opened, he ran the danger of clashing with the monopolies in the retail industry, such as Woolworths and Coles. His answer was that Woolworths and Coles had overhead and that he did not. The big Westland Shopping Centre supermarket was then built in his area, and it had to open on Friday evening as well. The upshot was that other traders, who had little consumer trading, were also forced to open. At the end of last year two of the major retailers in Whyalla were forced to close because of this situation. I have not heard members opposite refer to this type of thing. However, I have heard them say that the little fellow must be protected in industry. What are they talking about?

Mr. McAnaney: What are you talking about?

Mr. BROWN: Members opposite do not know what Friday evening shopping is; they have probably been out chasing dogs, and so on. The point I am making is that, because of their inconsistency, the retail traders have created a problem to which they can find no solution. They have wanted some legislation or provision to make them take a certain course. In the main area of the city of

Whyalla, the fact is that the retail traders did open, and one shop owned by Cox-Foys and another owned by Eudunda Farmers Co-operative Society Limited (not exactly small businesses) had to close because, amongst other things, they were not in the same area as the consumer. However, the Westland supermarket and "Mr. 5 per cent" were in consumer areas.

Since the Westland supermarket has opened on Friday evening, "Mr. 5 per cent" has opened on Thursday evening. He did not do this to benefit the consumer; he worked out that certain consumers received their pay cheque from their employers on Thursday, and that made him decide to open. After he had opened, the Westland supermarket opened for a trial period on Thursday evenings but, as its overhead was too great, it was forced to close down. Members have spoken about the retail traders wanting one plan or another, but the fact is that they have not been able to agree among themselves. I sincerely believe that the present legislation is an honest and proper attempt by a responsible Government to solve a difficult problem. No member can deny that this problem has been difficult to solve. Any member who has had late night shopping in his district knows how difficult it has been. Surely it is only common sense that someone must come up with a reasonable solution to the problem. We believe that our solution is reasonable and will be at the least cost to the consumers.

In their pamphlet, the retail traders say that it is estimated that wage costs will rise between 20 per cent and 25 per cent, depending on the types of store. I flatly deny that that will happen, and neither the traders nor any member opposite has justified this statement. I am sure that this would not happen if Myers and Woolworths opened on Friday evenings in the district of the member for Salisbury. Since this problem first arose, members opposite have done nothing but criticize the Government; they have not put forward any constructive suggestion at all. We believe that this Bill is an attempt to bring the Retail Traders Association back to uniform trading hours. We also want to provide for the buying public, and for the young girls or boys whom we all seem to forget and who work for a meagre pittance, when we consider the finances of the big retail monopolies. I support the Bill.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): Until the member for Whyalla spoke, only city members had spoken on the Bill. I have listened to the member for Whyalla, with interest, because I believe country members should express an opinion about the matter although, as it is drafted, the Bill does not affect shopping hours outside the metropolitan area. However, the member for Whyalla merely repeated what had been said by previous speakers. At Port Lincoln we have recently had an example of the Government's ineptitude with regard to shopping hours. In this case, the Minister showed his complete inability to make up his mind on the issue. About three weeks ago, I asked a series of questions about the shopping hours poll taken at Port Lincoln. My questions were either dodged or, in some cases, not answered. I take this opportunity to point out to the Minister that I am still awaiting answers to at least two questions; I hope I will receive those answers before Parliament goes into recess.

The Minister and the Government have shown uncertainty in their whole approach to this vexed question of shopping hours. The present Industrial Code was enacted in 1967, and this Bill is the fifth Bill amending that Act. I should like now to refer to the Industrial Code Amendment Act, which was passed in 1970 and which related to shopping hours. That amending Act enacted new section 227 (5), which provides:

The council must advise the Minister of the views it has ascertained of persons (including shopkeepers and shop assistants) resident in the area and affected by the application upon the subject of the application.

It also enacted new section 227 (6), which provides:

The Minister may require the Returning Officer for the State to conduct a poll of all electors on the roll of electors for the House of Assembly at the date of the application, and resident within the area of the council, in order to ascertain their views on the subject of the application.

Those two sections deal specifically with applications to vary shopping hours made by persons in shopping areas outside of the metropolitan area. On March 1, I asked the Minister why it was considered necessary to hold a poll on shopping hours in Port Lincoln when the Government obviously intended to alter shopping hours throughout the whole State, and the Minister replied that it had been decided to hold a poll and that he understood this was normal. At one stage (I admit against Standing Orders, Sir) I interjected, "You are saying it is mandatory," in reply to which the Minister

said, "The decision of a poll is mandatory." I again remind the Minister of section 227 (6), which provides that the Minister may require a poll to be conducted. This is yet another example of how the Minister will not make a decision on these matters. Because this Bill does not alter shopping hours outside the metropolitan area, I will not deal further with the matter of shopping hours in Port Lincoln. However, I use that as an example to illustrate the indecision not only of the Minister but also of the Government on the whole matter of shopping hours.

I should like now to refer to the fiasco of the last few weeks. In his second reading explanation the Minister made the following statement which has been quoted by many speakers this evening but which, I think, bears repetition:

It is therefore necessary for the Government to introduce this Bill in the terms which it considers are in the best interest of the majority.

One could ask in the majority of whom is it considered to be in the best interest. Is it in the best interests of the majority of shop assistants or the majority of people in the metropolitan area? The editorial in the *Advertiser* of March 16 sums up well the feeling of the people on this matter, and it certainly sums up my feeling. Part of it is as follows:

Those terms, involving a five-day 40-hour week for shop assistants ending at 5.30 p.m. on Friday, with overtime rates applying after that, make it clear which majority the Government has considered. It is not a majority of the public. Although there is obviously a strong demand for late night shopping in South Australia, there must also be almost universal opposition to the higher costs which the Government's scheme seems necessarily to involve.

If the Minister still maintains that this Bill is in the interests of the majority of people, how does he tie in that opinion with the result of the referendum, which has been mentioned several times this evening but which bears repetition? This matter has been thrashed out many times previously as well as this evening. It is generally conceded in the community that the question asked in the referendum was badly worded, that it was generally a mess, and that it was the beginning of the trouble in which the Government finds itself today regarding shopping hours. I am sure that the result of the referendum was a shock to the Government, as evidenced by the many days it took the Government after the referendum to announce what action it intended to take. Nevertheless, after

that delay it said that, because the majority of the public obviously did not want Friday evening shopping, it would abide by the decision of the referendum. Despite that, this Bill, which is a complete reversal of the statement made in 1970, is now before members. Indeed, the Bill is said to be in the best interests of the majority. That is a complete reversal and a contradiction by the Government, to which, I am sure, all members are becoming accustomed. If "majority" means the majority of shop assistants, how can the Minister justify this Bill? Is this Bill in the best interests of the majority of shop assistants?

One could ask whether a poll has been taken on this matter. I have heard of one, but it had nothing to do with the Government. Certainly, I have not heard of any Government or union poll on this matter. Admittedly, a poll was taken in one store, and I do not think any member on the Government benches will deny that that is indeed an important store in this State, employing as it does so many shop assistants. Therefore, the results of its poll are significant and must be considered. The shop assistants in the store to which I have referred voted six to one in favour of a roster system. Much has been said this evening about intimidation.

Mr. Crimes: Hear, hear!

Mr. CARNIE: Although we hear this cry from the Government benches, I wonder what the reaction would have been if the Managing Director of the store to which I have referred had not put the issue forward for the shop assistants and explained to them what would happen under the overtime system that is supported by the Government. If there are retrenchments (which under this Bill are almost inevitable), would Mr. Glowrey not then be accused of not having put the matter fairly to the shop assistants? Would he not then be accused of being unfair? Members have heard much talk of intimidation, but I think it is a case of complete honesty in presenting the facts as they will undoubtedly affect shop assistants. There is another aspect that Government members would do well to remember: the ballot to which I have referred was a secret ballot, to which Government members and union members are unaccustomed. I should like now to refer to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* the morning after this poll was conducted.

Mr. Payne: You'd be lost without the *Advertiser*.

Mr. CARNIE: The *Advertiser* and the press generally have been significant in this campaign. The following appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser* the morning after the poll was taken:

The result of yesterday's secret ballot of Myer staff would have "no effect whatever on the shopping hours legislation", the branch secretary of the Shop Assistants Union (Mr. E. J. Goldsworthy) said last night.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Aren't we getting repetition now?

Mr. CARNIE: Yes. When a matter is important, it is worth repeating, according to Mr. Goldsworthy. Does Mr. Goldsworthy dictate to the Government?

Members interjecting:

Mr. CARNIE: This matter appears to touch on a very sore point. I should like now to refer to another aspect of the same news item that has not been referred to previously. The article continues:

The Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. McKee) said late last night that he had had no opportunity at that stage to discuss the Myer vote decision with Cabinet and so could not give a Government reaction to it.

He really did not need to give the Government's reaction to it; Mr. Goldsworthy had already spoken. Let me pass on to something else that Mr. Goldsworthy is reported to have said:

For a start, we have no way of checking the validity of the voting figures.

Is he implying falsification in this case? I sincerely hope not. It is a damaging remark. The fact that we are now debating this Bill proves that Mr. Goldsworthy was correct: this secret ballot of the staff of Myers had no effect on Government legislation. Mr. Goldsworthy knew what he was talking about more than the Minister did, because the Minister said he could not comment on the matter because it had not been discussed in Cabinet. But his masters had spoken.

What right has Mr. Goldsworthy to speak for the shop assistants of South Australia? We have heard Government members say this evening, there are 51,000 shop assistants in South Australia and a maximum of 7,500 members of the Shop Assistants Union. We are speaking of the majority of shop assistants, however. The Government would like to see many more shop assistants members of the union. More than any other issue of recent times, this legislation shows who runs the State. It is certainly not the Government front bench members: it is the unions that tell the Government what to do.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CARNIE: It is true that South Australians are becoming more and more aware of this.

Mr. Payne: What do you know about unions? Nothing.

Mr. CARNIE: I believe in Friday evening shopping because that is what the people in the metropolitan area want.

Mr. Langley: What about Port Lincoln?

Mr. CARNIE: I did not deal fully with Port Lincoln, but because of what the member for Unley has said I will come back to it. At Port Lincoln the minorities were making the decisions because there was a 14 per cent vote and just over 50 per cent of those people said "Yes", so that just over 8 per cent of the people of Port Lincoln made the decision. I am not arguing whether that is right or wrong, but the people want Friday evening shopping. The referendum did not give the people the opportunity to say what they wanted. I think the people of the metropolitan area want extended shopping hours even though it must cause some increase in costs. That is inevitable.

I was interested to hear the member for Whyalla put forward an argument backed by figures that were difficult to follow, but he is the only member opposite who has said that Friday evening shopping will not bring about an increase in costs. This has never been denied by the Minister. The member for Whyalla thinks that Friday evening shopping will not cause an increase in costs, but no other member opposite has said that. The whole argument centres on the degree of the increase; and no-one can deny that there must be an increase and that the Government Bill must cause a greater increase in costs than the roster system would.

I defy the Minister still to say that this Bill is in the interests of the majority of people in the metropolitan area. It provides for an increase in pay for shop assistants for working an 89-hour fortnight and being paid overtime. The member for Playford tried to point out that clause 5 might not cause an increase. This was a complete smoke screen; the member for Playford did not speak on these matters with his usual conviction. He knows perfectly well that clause 5 provides that the hours of work worked by shop assistants outside the hours of 8.30 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays shall not be regarded as ordinary hours of work.

As a shopkeeper, I have employed labour, and outside the ordinary hours of work at least time and a half is necessary. The member for Playford tried to say that it might not be necessary, that the Industrial Code might provide for no set hours of overtime to be laid down; but there must be a big increase in costs that all sections of the community, including the shop assistants themselves, must face. It will affect all levels of the community. The R.T.A. scheme calls for an 80-hour fortnight worked on a roster system. I quote now from the Minister's second reading explanation. This is the hoary old one that is always brought up by members of the A.L.P. The Minister said:

Although it has been suggested that the amendments contained in this Bill will cause substantial increases in costs and therefore in prices, it must be recognized that any extension in trading hours would involve some increase in costs.

Apparently, the member for Whyalla does not agree with that. The Minister continued:

However, with the profits being made by larger retail stores we cannot accept that there is no room for absorption of some of the additional costs which will be involved, and we do not accept the suggestions that this legislation will cause substantial increases in prices.

This was vigorously backed up by the member for Florey, who spoke of the gigantic profits of some retail traders. In passing, I point out that Government members have mentioned only the big shops: it has not mentioned the effect that this legislation will have on the small corner grocer or the other small shopkeepers. I remember the honourable member speaking vigorously against Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited when its recent profits were announced. When the member for Florey was speaking on this, he never mentioned the percentage return on invested capital. He quoted figures that sound great taken out of context but, when taken in conjunction with invested capital, they simply represent normal business return on capital invested. If the honourable member had to invest some money (he seems to be a successful and a capable man), he would look for an investment that would give him a decent percentage return. Forget about money: it is only the percentage of return that matters. Shareholders invest in any company for the return they can get, and surely they are entitled to expect an adequate return. If the profits drop (and this can happen to any firm, not specifically a retail shop) the

shareholders get out. They take out their money and look elsewhere for an investment. If shareholders' funds dry up, the firm concerned is in trouble, and unemployment results ultimately. So what is the point in being granted overtime and much extra pay if there is no job at the end of it? The roster system ensures that no-one loses his job. There would probably be some increase in pay and, as the member for Torrens said and as has been stated in the press many times, there will be a three-day weekend every two weeks. Let us compare this with the variations offered by the Government.

As I see it, there are two variations: the first is to pay overtime on Friday night and Saturday at the rate of time and a half for all work. The alternative is that the shop owner can close the premises on Friday night or Saturday or, indeed, at some other time during the week. If this course were adopted, staff would not be classified as full-time, and this could affect their annual leave entitlement, sick benefits, superannuation and long service leave, and so on. I understand that superannuation would be affected, because basic hours worked from Monday to 5.30 p.m. on Friday would be reduced and, although overtime payments for Friday evening and Saturday morning would increase the total weekly take-home pay possibly to what would apply under the old 40-hour rate, the superannuation rate would be based on hours worked, excluding overtime.

Myer employees obviously believed in and supported the roster system and the position was put to them fairly, despite the Government smokescreen claiming intimidation. I support the Bill, because I believe in Friday night shopping, but I cannot support clause 5, which will cause a serious increase in costs affecting every section of the community, at a time when the community has already been hard hit by other cost increases caused by the stupidity of and ridiculous legislation enacted by this Government.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): The member for Flinders spent most of his time criticizing a trade union and a union secretary, as did other Opposition members, but we on this side are accustomed to their attitude, which is adopted in respect of almost every measure debated in the House. It is obvious to us that Opposition members do not want to see trade unions exist in this State at all. However, we do not say that there should not be a chamber of manufactures or an employers federation. I believe that employees and employers

should form their own organizations to represent them. The member for Flinders said that the number of unionists present at the Shop Assistants Union meeting, when the union decision was taken, was small in comparison with the number of non-unionist members, but we on this side could ask how many members of the Retail Traders Association were present when the association made its decision in the matter.

Shop trading hours has been a vexed question concerning not only this Government but also many past Governments, right back to 1900, when the Early Closing Act was first enacted. That Act came about as the result of agitation by shop assistants at the time for regular working hours and, indeed, some employers also wanted regular working hours for themselves. Voluntary closing was tried but failed, because some greedy shopkeepers decided to keep their shops open when others were closed, thereby getting extra business for themselves. Since then, the Act has been amended many times, including changes to the list of exempted shops and goods, and provisions relating to petitioning, counter-petitioning, the holding of polls, and variations in the boundaries of the metropolitan shopping district. Having recently looked at paper clippings relating to the period between 1900 and about 1910, one would think they referred to the press statements and letters to the Editor that we see published today. Indeed, what was stated then is being reiterated in the press now. Unfortunately, from 1926 a succession of Liberal and Country League Governments allowed the metropolitan shopping area boundaries to drift, and I remind the House that Sir Thomas Playford remained Premier of the State between 1945 and 1965, because of the unfair electoral system existing in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Tea Tree Gully.

Mrs. BYRNE: If L.C.L. Governments, which were continuously in Government for 32 years, had tried to alter the metropolitan shopping district as defined in the Act, we would not be debating this issue to the extent that we are debating it now, and it would not be the public issue that it is today. I know that this Bill will not be the end of the matter; indeed, I personally believe that there will never be an end to the matter, because three groups are involved (the public, the shop assistants, and the retail traders), and obviously opinions differ even within those groups.

Therefore, it is virtually impossible to find a solution satisfactory to everyone, and any agreement reached will only be a compromise. That is why the previous Hall Liberal Government took no action in the matter.

Mr. Harrison: It was a hot potato.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. The member for Torrens said that his Government took action, but he failed to say that the Bill introduced to amend the Early Closing Act was never passed. A synopsis of that Bill is as follows:

This short Bill sought to extend the range of goods which may be legally sold outside normal trading hours and to add art shops and aquarium shops to the schedule of exempted shops. It also proposed an amendment to make it clear that the Act did not prevent the sale of liquor from licensed premises at times when it may lawfully be supplied under the Licensing Act.

That is all the Bill consisted of: it did not cover the issue being debated now. The relevant provisions were omitted, because the then L.C.L. Government did not know how to tackle the problem. The synopsis continues:

After three speakers had taken part in the debate, the second reading of the Bill was passed on December 4-5. However, only one clause was passed in the Committee before progress was reported. The Bill lapsed on prorogation, but is restorable under section 57 of the Constitution Act.

If that Government had really wanted to enact the legislation, it could have enacted it. In his second reading explanation the Minister stated, as I have already mentioned, that it was not possible to reconcile the differing views of the retailers (the employers) on the one hand and the trade unions, as the employees' representatives, on the other hand. He went on to say:

It is therefore necessary for the Government to introduce this Bill in the terms which it considers are in the best interests of the majority. Accordingly, as well as providing for the extended trading times on Fridays, the Bill provides that shop assistants in the metropolitan area are to work their normal working week between Monday and Friday.

As has been stated by previous speakers, this is one group of employees that has been unable to obtain a five-day working week. Members opposite have suggested that the Government is not protecting the shop assistants through this legislation. I hope there are many shop assistants in the gallery, because I wish to point out to them, and to members opposite, that it will not be a question of whether shop assistants are going to work on Friday evening or Saturday morning (which they are not compelled to do under this legislation, anyway) if the L.C.L.

is elected to office in the future: shop assistants will be working seven days a week.

Mr. Jennings: Which L.C.L.?

Mrs. BYRNE: That is debatable.

Mr. McAnaney: What are your grounds for saying that?

Mrs. BYRNE: I have good grounds for saying that. The former Leader, the member for Gouger, stated on October 20, 1970, at page 1893 of *Hansard* when he was speaking previously to the Industrial Code Amendment Bill:

No, obviously the Minister does not follow it. Although introducing the Bill and allowing people to believe that he is going to give something, he in fact takes away Saturday afternoon, Sunday, and Friday night shopping.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And you object to it!

Mr. HALL: Yes, I do. I do not believe there need be any restriction on shopping hours at all. The way shopping hours have developed north and south of the city proves that they will develop sensibly.

Presumably he was speaking on behalf of the Opposition, and advocating trading seven days a week and, obviously, members opposite do not care whether employees work seven days a week or not. I take this argument further, because members opposite now purport to speak on behalf of the welfare of shop assistants and, if they were in power next week, they would have them working seven days a week. I have literature put out by the Liberal Party candidate for Sturt (Mr. Wilson) and by my opponent (Mr. Brassington) who say—

Mr. Clark: What Liberal Party is this?

Mrs. BYRNE: The one led recently by Mr. Hall and I presume the policy is the same. They state:

That includes your right to choose when and where you shop . . .

In other words, if you vote for the L.C.L., shop assistants will not be deciding whether they work Friday night or Saturday morning (which they are not required to do by this legislation); they will be worrying whether they will be forced to work seven days a week. Members on this side of the House know that the Retail Traders Association is not satisfied with this proposal, and that is its right. I contend that the proposal will work if employers genuinely try to make it work, and there is no need for shop assistants to be disadvantaged or for retrenchments to take place. We on this side have the interests of shop assistants at heart and I know that we do not wish to see them disadvantaged or retrenched.

Experience has shown that Friday night shopping in my district did not result in any price increases, and when it was discontinued there were no price decreases. In my district there are still shop assistants working on weekends, and I do not refer to delicatessens, but to shop trading on the weekend and selling exempt goods, which is within the present law. However, no-one has up to now worried about the persons involved there. Differing percentages of price increases have been mentioned, but none of these has been backed up with any statistics to prove how they were determined, and these statistics are all hypothetical. I am confident that any price rises that may occur will be of course closely watched by the Prices Commissioner, in whom I have every confidence.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): In rising to speak to this Bill I say, first, that it is one of appeasement and is evidence of the extent to which the Government has capitulated to the demands of the union on this issue. In introducing this Bill to the House last week, I believe that the Premier found himself in a dilemma, because any principles he may have had over the control of price increases flowing from late-night shopping had to be thrown overboard. I believe that the Premier was in favour of acceptance of the plan of the Retail Traders Association, because his heart was not in the Bill that was introduced. He made a poor impression when he spoke recently on television and he did not convince the public that this Bill was in the interests of the people for whom it is intended.

Mr. Langley: Have you ever—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is speaking to the Bill. She deserves a fair hearing from Government members and Opposition members. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mrs. STEELE: Further, it was obvious to members in the House last Tuesday afternoon that the Premier's credibility on this Bill was in doubt.

Mr. Jennings: Yours did a bit of a downturn on Wednesday, didn't it?

Mrs. STEELE: I am speaking of Tuesday. Incidentally, I read the paper on Wednesday morning to see the extent to which this had been reported and, to my amazement, I found not one word. I understand that this was because at the Premier's request he did not want any publicity last week, as he had his Commonwealth colleagues in Adelaide.

Mr. Clark: Pity you didn't ask yours over last week.

Mrs. STEELE: We hear many rumours in this place. This one was substantiated by the fact that not one word of last Tuesday's debate, in which the Premier came off second best, was reported in the paper. His credibility was clearly in doubt. Opposition members do not minimize in any way the difficulty that faces Governments on the issue of late night shopping, because we were confronted with it when in Government. However, at least we did not involve the State in the expense of a referendum to resolve the issue, and my colleague the member for Torrens, who was the Minister of Labour and Industry during the greater part of the time we were in Government, was assiduous in his associations with the union in trying to resolve this vexed question. I sympathize with the Government that it is not an easy issue to resolve.

We realized that this was an issue that was simmering all the time we were in office and it was obvious it was coming to the boil; eventually, it had to come into the House to be resolved. There is no doubt that ever since the Government has been in office it has vacillated on the issue and has changed its attitude time and time again; this is on record for anyone to see. It avoided its responsibilities as a Government to make a firm decision on the issue of late hours shopping, and it initiated a referendum that was a complete and utter farce, conducted at great cost to the State. At the time, it was aided by the Retail Traders Association, and it was claimed by the Government that the people had clearly spoken through the ballot-box.

I do not think there is any doubt in anyone's mind that there was great confusion over that referendum because the questions on which people were asked to vote were ambiguous, and the Government took no notice of the Opposition when we tried to amend it here. Everyone knows how farcical the referendum was, because the scheme put forward by the Government now has no relationship to the referendum held previously. The Government has completely negated the result of the referendum, and the Bill now before us provides for late night shopping, which was the very thing the referendum indicated to the Government was not wanted here in South Australia.

So the Government has done a complete about face. The members opposite who represent areas in which late night shopping previously operated, namely, the members for Playford, Mawson, Tea Tree Gully, Elizabeth

and Salisbury were aware that this amenity for the public had operated to the complete satisfaction of those who wanted to shop, of the shop assistants, of those people who were happy to have some occupation on the side that brought in extra income, and to the traders themselves. These unfortunate members have been hopping in and out of the political frypan ever since. Now the Government is trying to promote an unpopular move in order to appease these members and have them returned at the next election. As a result, it has made an absolute capitulation to the trade union movement.

Mr. Clark: You said before that the trade union stopped us from doing it.

Mrs. STEELE: The member for Elizabeth could not have been listening properly. On the basis of a meeting attended by only a couple of hundred shop assistant members of the union, when I understand it represents thousands, and which supported the plan put up by the Shop Assistants Union, to which other unions had pledged some support, Mr. Goldsworthy, the Secretary of the union, reckoned that he had the overwhelming support of the shop assistants and was able to persuade the Government (or perhaps "force" is the more appropriate word) to initiate this unpopular legislation. The meeting of the Shop Assistants Union was in great contrast to the meeting of shop assistants of a leading retail store. These shop assistants conducted their own ballot; there was no intimidation and they overwhelmingly rejected the Government's proposed legislation and supported the plan put forward by the Retail Traders Association. I believe that if certain other retail stores had held similar meetings a similar result would have been forthcoming.

In the last 24 hours several representations, personally, by phone and by letter have been made to me. I have also received a telegram signed by 39 people pledging their support for the Retail Traders Association plan. I suppose that, in all, this amounts to more than 100 representations, which is not bad for a district which has not had late-hour shopping and which is not particularly interested in it. Imagine how great would be the numbers received in districts held by members in which late-night shopping has applied in the past. There is no doubt that the effect of the Bill, if passed, will be to force prices up. It cannot do otherwise because, under the legislation, Friday night and Saturday morning work will have to be paid at overtime rates.

I believe that, because of this, it is ridiculous to claim, in the face of unavoidable price rises that will ensue, that this legislation will be in the best interests of the people of South Australia. I have been in Melbourne on a Friday night on two occasions since late-night shopping was introduced there and there is no doubt how popular this innovation is and the difference it makes to the city. Previous speakers have referred to the embargo placed on buying meat in supermarkets which have this facility, and most modern supermarkets include a butcher shop section. It seems absurd that people who go to a supermarket on a Friday evening to do their shopping (and this includes women who may be employed during the day) can buy every commodity except meat.

Under new section 221 (1a), employees will commence work at 8.30 a.m. on a Saturday and continue until 12.30 p.m. I cannot believe that shop assistants will appreciate this unwelcome innovation, which will make a difference to the time they have available for recreation on a Saturday afternoon. Under the plan of the retail traders, employees would be able to have off every alternate Saturday, with the opportunity of a three-day weekend every alternate weekend. On the issue of hours alone, it would certainly be advantageous to shop assistants if the retail traders' plan were followed. As I have said before in this place, I favour Friday evening shopping, so I can go some way towards supporting the Bill. However, I certainly do not favour the plan as provided in some of the clauses.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): Much has already been said about the integrity of retail traders, and I do not intend to pursue that topic. I believe that shop assistants should be entitled to enjoy the same hours and conditions as apply to employees in other industries.

Mr. Rodda: What about farmers?

Mr. GROTH: The farmers can look after themselves, and the honourable member has not been doing so badly. I can see nothing wrong with shop assistants being entitled to a 40-hour week to be worked between Monday and Friday, with penalty rates to be paid for any time worked after that period, as applies in other industries. The retail traders appear to be unable to agree on the matter; one group supports one system and a different group supports another. I think that the member for Mitcham passed over what was contained in the stop press of today's *News*. The South Australian Retail Storekeepers Association has

advocated a 40-hour week over five days, with late night shopping on a Friday, but closing of the shops on a Saturday. Another article refers to the position in Sydney, as follows:

The food retailers association of New South Wales is to fight for a standard five-day shopping week, Monday to Friday, with a late night on Friday. This has been decided on behalf of the grocery trade here, including the important shopping districts of Newcastle and Wollongong. Experiences of the past two months, since late shopping was permitted in Sydney and some other parts of the State, have been studied carefully, particularly in relation to the economics of trading under the changed conditions. This decision by New South Wales retailers will be of considerable importance to other States, some of which are still undecided and are awaiting the results of late shopping experience in New South Wales.

Therefore, the traders themselves are unable to agree on which system to adopt. We know that New South Wales has shopping on Thursday evening, under the roster system. Apparently that is not satisfactory to the food retailers in that State. One member opposite (it could have been the member for Mitcham) referred to 120 shop assistants voting on this issue. Let me quote the following information:

The union has been most consistent in its demand for a 40-hour, five-day week to finish no later than 5.30 on Friday, with overtime payment to be made for all time worked outside these hours. This policy has been endorsed by no less than four general meetings. On January 12, a special general meeting was held at the Woodville Townhall for the specific purpose of debating this issue; 1,200 members attended and voted, after 2½ hours at debate, in favour of the union policy. At general meetings in February and March, members voted overwhelmingly in favour of the proposal now being pursued by the union.

Apparently the honourable member who referred to 120 people could not read.

Mrs. Byrne: I bet there were not 1,200 people at the meeting of the Retail Traders Association.

Mr. GROTH: It might have been more like 12. As most aspects of this matter have been dealt with, I do not intend to take up the time of the House, but it is apparent that there is a real demand for Friday evening shopping. The fact is that trade unions representing workers employed in the retail trade realize that other workers are demanding a late shopping night. The Government believes that Friday evening shopping is wanted by many people, particularly by husbands and wives who are both working. I therefore have much pleasure in support of the Bill.

[Midnight]

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): At this hour of the morning I intend to be brief. Members on both sides have gone through the history surrounding the introduction of late night shopping on Fridays. The only thing that seems to be at issue is the most satisfactory method of achieving this. When the Minister gave notice of the introduction of the Bill, I doubt whether he knew which Bill he was going to introduce.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's unkind.

Dr. TONKIN: It is probably near the mark.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is unkind and it is completely off the mark, and you know it.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister of Labour and Industry did not seem to be able to make up his mind for some time. He vacillated and went from one point of view to another. There was no doubt in the mind of anyone on this side that the union's view would prevail. Indeed, it seems to be prevailing a good deal on the Government benches.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you anti-union?

Dr. TONKIN: I am not anti-union, but the union view seems to be in the ascendancy on the Government side of the House.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Aren't you a union member?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and I am not saying that that is a bad thing.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The A.M.A. is the strongest union—

Dr. TONKIN: I will not be led aside by the Minister's interjections. If he is willing to sit here a few minutes longer wasting the time of the House by interjecting, I have no objection. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

The Government considers it appropriate that the five-day week which applies to almost every other employed person in the State should be granted to these employees, who will be expected to give additional service to the public in the metropolitan area with the longer trading hours.

That is probably fair enough. This is a matter of what is in the best interests of the employees. In this respect, I refer to the housewives, who constitute a large proportion of customers. I wonder what they would say if someone tried to give them a guaranteed five-day week; I think they would laugh. I cannot see anything wrong with the introduction of a roster system, with shop assistants working 80 hours over 14 days. The interest of the majority has been quoted many times this evening. However, the interest of the

majority, which surely must be considered, cannot be estimated by the relatively small membership of the union.

Government members who have spoken obviously did not put their hearts into the debate. I agree with the member for Flinders and the member for Davenport that the member for Playford put up an eloquent smoke-screen. He should have got together beforehand with the member for Whyalla, or *vice versa*, as the member for Playford advanced an eloquent case for increased take-home pay for shop assistants. He was probably practising for his next wage case. The member for Whyalla told us, however, that the most significant part of this whole plan was the retention of the five-day 40-hour week. If shop assistants are to increase their salaries, as the member for Playford wants them to, they must work more than a five-day 40-hour week. This is neither a pay increase nor a 40-hour week; each seems to be cancelling the other out, or certainly contradicting the other.

I am sorry that the member for Florey has been precluded from coming into the Chamber later this evening because of his indisposition. He obviously put much feeling and deep thought into his speech, pointing out that the benefits of the union were well worth having. He said that the unions represented the thoughts of all shop assistants in the matter and that what the unions said regarding an overtime system was all that mattered. However, the member for Flinders pointed out that, of the 50,000 shop assistants in this State, only about 7,500 think the union is worth joining.

The member for Florey referred to all the terrible, wicked things that the retail traders have done. I am surprised that they can sleep at night! Apparently they have taken out full-page advertisements in the newspapers. What a shocking thing! The member for Florey pointed out to the public the increased costs that could result from the passage of this legislation. The honourable member's voice would drop down to 60 decibels from his usual 100 decibels if he were here now. He referred to the telegrams and telephone messages that had been sent to members of Parliament. The member for Playford then spoke of the telegrams sent to other interested members in the Elizabeth area.

The Attorney-General is fond of saying that suggestions are faintly made. However, this was far from faint. The suggestion was

made by several members opposite that the meetings of shop assistants held to discuss this matter, particularly the one held at Myers, were held under duress and that the votes, particularly those taken in the secret poll at Myers, were obtained under duress. However, only one person in six voted for the overtime system. It is amazing how these things go around the full circle, because it is a terrible thing to exert by inference any sort of pressure on shop assistants regarding the taking of a vote. However, the same union officials who are complaining and squealing now are the very ones who, as a result of duress and extreme pressure exerted on the retail traders, are advocating compulsory unionism and who will stop at nothing to obtain it. Obviously, if the union can attract only 7,500 out of 50,000 shop assistants to its ranks, there is something wrong. It is clear that many shop assistants do not want to join a union, and are satisfied—

Mr. Langley: Of course, they will take the benefits that are fought for.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Florey said once more that the principal firms of the R.T.A. could well afford to absorb the extra costs, but that may have been wishful thinking. Perhaps he thought it would make up for all the evil things that the firms have done in pointing out what increased costs would result. I am sure the honourable member does not have any real interest in the number of shareholders of a firm, in the capital outlay involved, in the percentage return, in how much each shareholder gets, or in what dividend is returned. These are all important things when one is assessing whether or not an organization can run at a profit or a loss. The honourable member obviously has no idea of capital investment; that is obvious from the remarks he made.

The member for Florey said that overtime would help the workers, but I do not know about that. The provision of a three-day week-end has been commented upon favourably by shop assistants in other States. Shop assistants here are looking forward to it, although it appears that it will be denied them. I have had numerous representations from shop assistants, and I am sure that they have not been made under duress. I have spoken to shop assistants in Myers, David Jones and John Martins when I have visited those stores during the last week, but I found not even one in favour of the overtime system. What

is the problem? Why is it that none of these people who are involved, these shop assistants about whom the Minister says he is so concerned and whom he has to look after to ensure that they are not victimized, wants the sort of help the Minister is offering?

Mr. Payne: That is untrue and you know it.

Dr. TONKIN: What is the difference? What is the problem here? There is something that does not add up. There is no doubt that the increased costs resulting from the overtime system would lead to some people losing their jobs. The Minister and the union officials are forgetting that the shop assistants themselves, as customers, will have to pay the increased prices. Maybe the shop assistants are getting frightened of the Minister, the trade union officials and the members of the Government, because the members of the Government and the union officials seem to be singularly short-sighted when it comes to assessing the effect of the increased costs. Far from thinking he will be exempt from having to pay the extra charges that will result, the average shop assistant is alive to the extra charges and is much wiser than those people who are trying to foist the overtime system on to him.

The only opposition that I have come across to the roster system has been the straight opposition to the system of Friday evening shopping anyway, and that still persists in the community. I believe the union officials are the people who are basically to blame and will be to blame if costs rise in this State. It may well cost some shop assistants their jobs. I am pleased that some members opposite are at least thinking about these possibilities.

I remember two years ago reading an account of a printing firm in Sydney that was situated in an inner industrial suburb. It expanded and wanted new presses to meet competition from other firms. Each time a piece of new equipment went in, it was frustrated by the union officials demanding an increase in wages. This happened once too often and the business, which was a family concern, discovered it would be better off if it sold up. It proceeded to do that. When it told the union official what it intended to do, he was so taken aback that he could only fall back on his standard remark, "I will take them out on strike." But it was too late to do that, and we should learn a lesson from that incident.

Union officials have a heavy responsibility to the members of their unions. In this case, with 7,500 members out of a possible 50,000 members, I can only deduce that the service it is offering its members is not particularly good. The union has given directions to the Government in this matter. Make no mistake about it—this Government has been told what it should do. We have had the example this evening of Mr. Goldsworthy, who does not know whether he is upstairs, downstairs or merely in the Chamber, talking to members opposite. I have no doubt that instructions have been given.

Mr. Mathwin: He interjected at one stage.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not think we should take notice of interjections from the gallery. Members of the union are being used. I wonder whether Mr. Goldsworthy is aspiring, by his assiduous attention in this regard, to a seat in this House. That seems to be the reward that is often given. I do not agree with the instructions that he and his union have given the Government on this occasion, and I cannot support him.

I do not think that the interests of the majority of people are really being thought of here. It is the action of a union-dominated Government being instructed by the Trades Hall or its representatives, and it is one more example of government of South Australia from the Trades Hall. I do not believe that the people of South Australia will forget the high-handed attempt of a union to force compulsory unionism on to people who do not want it. This attempted enforcement is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. I do not support the principle of dictation by unions to Governments.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I think there is a basic and most unusual similarity between the member for Bragg and me this evening: both of us got to our feet rather late in this debate, at a time when everything that could possibly be said had been said. Therefore, although the member for Bragg managed to take a considerable amount of time to say nothing, I shall take only a little time to say a little more.

In supporting the Bill, I should like to chide one or two of my colleagues on this side who, by way of interjection, suggested that the member for Bragg was anti-union. How could he possibly be anti-union when he is a member of the most powerful union in the Commonwealth of Australia? What my colleagues meant

was that his attitude towards a union depended entirely on the nature of the union, but one cannot always spell this out by way of interjection.

The way was prepared for this legislation by the publication of the result of a Gallup poll recently showing that now across the whole of Australia, in every State, a clear majority of people favours Friday evening trading. That is an alteration of the situation that existed only 12 months ago. It is interesting to note this drift in public opinion. I believe that probably the continuing dialogue that has gone on since this whole matter was initiated over 12 months ago has materially assisted in the swing of public opinion. People have got used to the concept of more convenient trading hours and are now better able to accept it because there is now this general, though not overwhelming, acceptance of this reform throughout the whole of the State and we are thus able to introduce it by way of legislation.

Many things have been said in this debate about the possible effects of the legislation as we have introduced it. I remind members that the history of the last 12 months has shown the problems and difficulties in the way of prediction, and I illustrate that simply by referring to three things that were said to me when Friday evening shopping was temporarily halted in my own electoral district. These were, first, that this would lead to a reduction in local employment; secondly, that it would lead to a mad shopping rush on Saturday mornings; and, thirdly, that there would be no further commercial development in the area. It is interesting to look briefly at each of these suggestions. First, so far as I am aware, there has been no significant reduction of employment in the retail trade in my district. Indeed, now that we turn to the question of extending hours, we are told that this will lead to a reduction of employment. To harmonize those two situations (where, on the one hand, we are told that reduced hours will reduce employment and, now, that longer hours will reduce employment) is a sophistication that is completely beyond my ken.

Secondly, as I have already indicated, we were told that there would be a mad rush on Saturday mornings. It was even suggested to me that there would be a much higher rate of traffic accidents on Beach Road, Christies Beach, as a result of Friday evening shoppers having to shop on Saturday morning. If there has been any increase in the Saturday morning trade, it has been only marginal. What, in

fact, has happened is that many people, especially housewives, have transferred their shopping pattern to Friday morning or afternoon, or to some other week day, and generally there has been a more even spread of shopping during the week. The fears that Saturday morning shopping at the major shopping outlets in the south would simply become a mad rush have not been realized.

Thirdly, we were told that there would be no further commercial developments in the area. In fact, the member for Mitcham voiced fears which he said had been expressed to him by people in my district about how they were all going to go broke. It is interesting to note that the previous Leader of the Opposition recently opened a new commercial development in my district (I refer to the extensions to the Big Y shopping centre at Morphett Vale), and we notice now that the bricks and mortar are going up for a Tom the Cheap supermarket, also on the Main South Road, Morphett Vale. The decision by Tom the Cheap to set up in the south was taken well before that organization could have known that the Friday evening facility would be returned to the area.

Mr. Harrison: He didn't have to take over an old picture theatre, either.

Mr. HOPGOOD: No, because there was none in the area. So much for the argument that this would kill commercial development in the area. I note these points in order to warn members against the difficulties of extrapolation in this area and the dangers they get themselves into when they start making dogmatic statements about this aspect or another of a certain measure. Although I have never made any use of Friday evening shopping (nor has my family), I support it, because I think it is sensible that there should be more convenient shopping hours for people. This is especially true of those who are out on the fringe (not in Morphett Vale or Christies Beach but in areas such as Hackham and Port Noarlunga South), and if other problems can be solved (and I believe that they largely have been solved) I believe that the facility should be introduced. For these reasons I am supporting its introduction.

I conclude with just a little history. In 1934, the State Labor Government of John Thomas Lang in New South Wales was dismissed from office by the Governor of that State (Sir Philip Game). An election campaign ensued in which was revealed an extremely high level of support for Lang and his Government; in fact, it was estimated at

the time that Lang spoke to 250,000 people at Moore Park during that campaign and yet, when the figures went up, his Government and his numbers were decimated. In the following week, when people started to scratch around for reasons for this most unexpected vote, one of the things that came out was that in their pay envelopes for the previous week workers had received a little notice which said, "If Lang is re-elected you may not have a job next Monday." I thought of this a week or so ago when a certain incident occurred in a large retail store in Adelaide, and I think in that case the people concerned badly over-reacted to the detriment of their own cause. I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Again, the Government has shown a complete disregard for the people concerned. The union called, and the Government jumped. I remind the House of the \$72,000 spent on the recent referendum, of which the Government took no notice. As with most measures introduced by the Government, that referendum involved compulsion, even though no action has been taken against those who did not vote, as one would expect would be taken pursuant to the provisions of the legislation relating to that referendum. The *Advertiser* of October 12, 1970, contains the following report:

Government's line on shop hours still clouded. A question mark still hangs over the Government's intention on shopping hours, following a secret meeting of Labor Party and trade union leaders on Saturday morning. The three-hour meeting, which the Minister of Labour and Industry—

there is now a new Minister—

A.L.P. officials and trade union leaders had denied knowledge of last week, was held at the Enfield District A.L.P.'s clubrooms at the Parkway, Klemzig. The rendezvous, a renovated house, fully fenced and well away from the street and its nearest neighbours, was ideal for the purpose. A club member kept constant watch for intruders.

The article later stated that the Premier, in his address at the meeting, "favoured holding to the *status quo*". However, the Premier has changed his mind about that. The following report appears in the *Advertiser* of December 14, 1971:

Talks between the State Government, retailers and the South Australian trade union movement are believed to have paved the way for Friday night shopping in the metropolitan area. If final agreement is reached between the parties, the Government is expected to introduce legislation . . . The Minister of Labour and Industry said yesterday that "broad agree-

ment" had been reached with the unions and retailers on the introduction of Friday night shopping.

However, a different story appeared on the following day (December 15), namely:

Adelaide retailers denied yesterday that broad agreement had been reached on shopping hours between the State Government, retailers and the unions.

The Government carried on nonchalantly until it received pressure from the union, the Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union (Mr. Goldsworthy) being determined that his members should agree to his decision. It was not long after that that there was a battle regarding compulsory unionism. I often wonder why the union insisted on compulsory unionism, and there are many reasons for this. However, I certainly do not believe it was for the workers' protection. It is obvious that the union leaders do not give their members credit for knowing what they themselves want. I have talked with many shop assistants recently and dozens of people have rung me up, and all of them desire the roster system. I do not believe for one moment that people were frog-marched to the telephone, as was suggested by the member for Florey.

A petition was brought to my home last night by people working on the first floor at Myer's store at Marion, signed by 39 people all in favour of the roster system. I spoke also to an employee on the second floor at that store and she informed me that she rang Parliament House and was directed to the member for Tea Tree Gully, who directed her to the Minister of Education. He took down a list of 14 names, but of course we have heard nothing more about that.

Mr. Harrison: What about naming them?

Mr. MATHWIN: You can see the petition if you wish.

Mr. Harrison: We want to see their names in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: Most of these people advocate the roster system. Much has been said about the recent secret ballot conducted by the Myer Emporium in which shop assistants voted in favour of the two-week roster system. Eight hundred and seventy-four employees voted in favour of it and 140 voted against it. The union secretary (Mr. Goldsworthy) has said:

The shopping hours ballot has no effect at all.

This was a secret ballot, which is more than can be said for the union. We know the union takes a vote by a show of hands, as is the case with nearly all the unions of which I know; there is no secret ballot attached to that. The employees of Myers were given the opportunity of a secret ballot, which gave them the protection of not having to toe the line when confronted by the union secretary. Mr. Goldsworthy would be far better advised to look after his people properly without fear or favour, because those people pay him his wages. Therefore, he is obliged to put their views correctly to the Government.

Mr. McRae: Would you say that outside the House?

Mr. MATHWIN: The secret ballot enables people to vote without fear or favour. The explanation given by Mr. Goldsworthy was that the retailers wanted too many variations. The answer from the Retail Traders Association was "poppycock". There is too much jiggery-pokery going on in the unions and they grasp at any straw. I ask the Premier, the Minister of Labour and Industry, or the union secretary, or whoever is running the show, why they do not take notice of the people concerned, because they must know the large number of people who have approached members of Parliament.

Mr. Langley: How many have approached you?

Mr. MATHWIN: I have received dozens of telephone calls. The member for Florey suggested that people were forced to ring us, and he suggested that large firms hated their workers. The member for Playford said that he sent telegrams to the Mayors of Salisbury and Elizabeth. My point is that, if you send such a telegram to a mayor of a large city and give him only two days notice, the possibility of his being able to attend would be nil, because a mayor is busier than a member of Parliament, and I can say that with authority. The member for Playford can say he sent a telegram to the mayors concerned on Sunday last, but did he really expect them to come down here at such short notice?

Mr. Clark: They expected us to attend a political meeting on one day's notice.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: You told me you enjoyed it.

Mr. Clark: I enjoyed it as much as I enjoy the shadow Cabinet Minister's speech now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is nothing in this Bill about shadow Ministers. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister of Labour and Industry has said that the will of the majority will prevail. I wonder whether he was referring to the referendum, because that was a distinct will of the majority. It was obvious that the Government was expecting a "Yes" vote, and it was unfortunate for it that the vote was "No". It is this that has put the Government in this most unfortunate position. Under this legislation employees are required to work on Fridays from 8.30 a.m. to 9 p.m. This is a long time for any person to do this work, because it is a matter of being on one's feet and it is tiring at the best of times, and to have such long hours is asking too much. I suggest that these people require more leisure time and that it is important for them to have time off. Under the roster system they will have time to go shopping; which is a luxury they have never had previously.

They will be able to go shopping on alternate Mondays and they will have three days off every other week, which is not a bad proposition. Much has been said about the shop assistants wanting overtime. How well does the Government know the requirements of shop assistants? It must be remembered that over 80 per cent of shop assistants are women. Possibly 70 per cent of these would be adults, mostly married with family responsibilities. These are the people who have stated in the strongest terms that they want increased leisure time in order to meet family demands rather than the inconvenience of increased working hours, even though it would mean increased income. However, it is important to note that those who want overtime can earn it under the roster system by request. I suggest that this Socialist Government in its socialistic manner is overriding the ordinary worker against his wishes because it thinks it has the right to think for these people who, Government members apparently believe, have not the ability to think for themselves. The socialistic aim is to stifle all initiative from private enterprise down to the private individual. Its doctrine is that individual freedom should be subordinated.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): Mr. Deputy Speaker—

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. McANANEY: Although my name is on the list before you, I was not called. Being a polite person I do not rise until I am called.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will know that I watch every member in the Chamber. No member, other than the Minister, rose. I said that if the Minister spoke he would close the debate, and I gave him the call. As the honourable member wishes to speak in this all-important debate, I will now give him the right to speak.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): This is a metropolitan area Bill. A Foodland store in my area stays open on Friday nights and all day on Saturday, and this works very well. Local people in the area are willing and keen to work on Saturday afternoon. However, I am not advocating this but, with the greater development of leisure time, a larger section of the community will be prepared to work on rostered hours. Shopkeepers in my area who do not want to open do not open, and not one of them has complained to me. If people could stay open on Friday night and Saturday morning and their profits increased, some shops might stay open for more than five days a week. They should be able to sell their goods more cheaply and attract trade. Another area in my district is under the Early Closing Act, and people seem to be happy about it. The member for Tea Tree Gully mentioned greedy storekeepers, but I do not like that kind of talk in the House. There are greedy lawyers, and some of the unions are greedy, so why pick on a certain section of the community which the Minister in charge of prices has said is not greedy.

Mr. McRae: Why do you dislike lawyers so much?

Mr. McANANEY: Only some of them.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about lawyers in the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister in charge of prices has said that the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs keeps a close eye on what retailers charge. Only recently in the House the Minister said that the prices charged were reasonable, because he was anxious that there should be keen competition between various sections of the community. The Minister also said that unjustified price increases would not be allowed.

Mr. Langley: That was in 1900.

Mr. McANANEY: I know that the Labor Party lives in the 1900's

The SPEAKER: Order! The time of the member for Unley has expired. The member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: When my Party moved an amendment for Friday night shopping last year I opposed it because it would have meant that a line would be drawn through Adelaide so that on one side of the line people could stay open, whereas on the other side of the line people could not stay open. If the legislation is to apply throughout the metropolitan area, I advocate that people should be able to trade for six days of the week.

Mr. Langley: What do you think of Sunday trading?

Mr. McANANEY: I do not agree with Sunday trading, because the family man should be able to go out and enjoy himself on that day. As some people like the roster system, I do not see why they should not be allowed to work under such a system. If one reads the newspapers one often becomes confused about what people say. The member for Florey mentioned the evils of compulsion, and it amazed me that, in some cases, shop assistants had been instructed to join the union. I always fight against the principle of compulsion to do something. As I do not know who would want to shop at 8.30 a.m., I do not understand that part of the Bill that provides for employees to start work at that time.

Mr. Wells: What about the Retail Traders Association?

Mr. McANANEY: I do not take instructions, as members opposite do. The unions did not get in quickly enough to tell the Premier what to say, and he made public statements about what he would do. The Government has been instructed by the unions generally on this matter. Although I believe that there should be shopping on six days a week, I do not believe in compelling people in any way.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): Just before you, Mr. Speaker, resumed your Chair, the Deputy Speaker gave me the call before the member for Heysen spoke. I was not aware that he intended to speak. As I think members know, I am a reasonably kind person, and I have an affection for the honourable member, apart from his politics. Out of courtesy to him, I decided to give him the privilege of speaking. I crossed the floor and asked him, "How long do you think you will go, Bill?" I added, "I feel like a cigarette." I felt that I could

leave the Chamber, because I did not think I would miss much, but the honourable member said, "You had better make it quick, because I won't last long." Obviously the member for Heysen is the only Opposition member who agrees with the Government's scheme.

Mr. McAnaney: Where did you get that idea?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I could see that he made only a token effort on behalf of the Country Party, or the Liberal and Country League, or as an Independent. I will not reply to what each member opposite said, as what they said was mainly repetitious. At certain stages, this debate has become heated. However, I suppose this can be expected when a political Party supports a Capitalist system. I am proud to be a member of the Australian Labor Party. We do not believe in the old theory of live and let live: we believe in living and helping to live. That is the reason why we support the people who work in retail stores. The member for Flinders made his speech from the *Advertiser*. I should say that, if members opposite did not have a copy of the *Advertiser* in their hip pockets, they would be speechless.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you take the *Sunday Mail* around with you?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Leader of the Opposition said that he was confused and bewildered, and was suffering from emotion. I will let honourable members form their own conclusions about the emotion from which he was suffering. If I were in his position, I would be petrified. His predecessor said that he was being stabbed in the back, and so on. That in itself is enough to distract a man, without having to concentrate on a Bill such as this. I sympathize with the Leader, who looks forlorn sitting there on his own. We do not know at this stage, and he does not know, whether he is the Leader of the Liberal and Country League, the Country Party—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is replying to the debate. He should not refer to matters not included in the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Great play has been made by Opposition members about a ballot conducted by Myers. It would be difficult for me to make up my mind about a roster system, because so many people have been placed under duress. The manager of that store has done a great disservice to his company in this State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Explain that.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The member for Playford has adequately explained it.

Mr. Venning: You explain it.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Manager of Myers has brought pressure on people and interfered in union affairs.

Mr. Venning: You don't interfere!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River knows very well that he is not permitted to interject when he is not in his own seat.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I should like honourable members to be placed in a similar position to that in which the shop assistants employed by the Myer Emporium were placed, when their Managing Director addressed them. He was quoted in his opening remarks as saying that, although he intended to conduct a secret ballot, if the Government scheme was accepted he would have to sack 200 of his employees. Surely members opposite are not going to tell the people of this State that those shop assistants were not under some sort of duress from the Managing Director who, I should have thought, would have been more responsible and would not have done his company so much harm.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He may have been speaking the truth.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: If he was, that is more than you did when you spoke.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I didn't speak, actually.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: We have all heard members opposite refer to the great increase in costs that will result from the passage of this legislation. I think some of the big retailers are suffering from a severe attack of hip pocket haemorrhage.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What are you talking about?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: You know what I am talking about.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must address the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Sir, I object to the Minister's saying that I always vote through my hip pocket.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I cannot accept the argument that the passage of this legislation will result in a large increase in costs.

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, I ask the Minister to withdraw his remark. He said I voted through my hip pocket, and I feel most insulted.

The SPEAKER: Does the Minister wish to withdraw his remark?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: If the honourable member does not have a hip pocket, I am willing to withdraw my remark. As I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted by the honourable member, I do not accept that this legislation will result in a large increase in prices. This has been borne out by various speakers on this side of the House. The Government is merely extending Friday evening shopping, which was in operation previously in the outer metropolitan area. Certain penalties were in force then, yet we heard no outcry regarding increased costs in those areas. Members have referred to a roster system. It is obvious that if a certain percentage of the people shop on a Friday evening, and they undoubtedly will, they will not shop on Saturday mornings, and the responsible business men of this State, in whom I have the greatest confidence, will confine their business hours in accordance with the demand, and they will organize their employees to cope with the demand.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about putting them on a roster?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: They could well be put on a roster. Indeed, the system the Government is proposing could well bring about a roster system because if, after people have shopped on Friday evening there is no demand in shops on Saturday morning, a responsible business man will undoubtedly work his staff accordingly to meet his demands. He will, therefore, organize a roster system for business that is conducted outside of normal trading hours.

Mr. McAnaney: They cannot be rostered over five days.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Of course, they cannot.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must address the Chair.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: If the penny dropped, the honourable member would realize that, if a percentage of people shop on Friday evenings, they will not shop on Saturday mornings, and that no responsible business man will bring in his staff merely to stand idle around the store. Supermarkets with 10 or 12 outlets, finding that people are not shopping on Satur-

day mornings because they have shopped the previous evening, will not keep cashiers at the end of each lane when the business does not warrant it. Business itself will create a roster system for overtime work, and this defeats the argument the retail stores are advancing that costs will be increased because, if staff is not brought in, they do not have to be paid. The member for Mitcham referred to a letter sent to the Premier by the Arndale shopping committee, and read the following part thereof to the House:

If the Government persists in introducing and supporting extended trading hours, it is our firm belief that the welfare and living conditions of the workers in our industry will best be served by the R.T.A. rostered scheme.

That letter continues as follows:

We point out, however, that this scheme is acceptable only on condition that we are not used as low-cost labour to give to the public and the consumer extended trading hours at our expense. We are adamant that 50 per cent loadings on Friday night and Saturday morning is the only condition under which we will accept the scheme.

It seems strange that the member for Mitcham did not continue to read the latter part of that letter. Perhaps he wanted to create a false impression in this House. If he did not want to do so, he would have read the rest of the letter. Members have heard so much about the small traders who will not benefit from the legislation. I point out that 10 years ago, before supermarkets and large retailers developed, independent retailers in South Australia captured 32 per cent of the market. Today, they capture 3 per cent of the market, and the big groups and chain stores attract 97 per cent between them. I believe this scheme will give to the smaller trader an opportunity to put himself back on a reasonable footing.

Mr. Coumbe: Isn't that wishful thinking?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable apology for Torrens would be well advised to call himself aside and have a talk with himself—and I think he knows what I mean. I have been involved in this issue over the last six months. I have had discussions with almost everyone associated with this trading and, having assessed the position of the retailers, the business people and the employees and having looked at the various profits involved in the retail business, I am of the opinion that the employees have been treated rather unkindly. This Bill is well overdue. For 22 years, I understand, these people have been

asking for a 5-day, 40-hour week or at least to be put in the same position as their counterparts working in other industries.

This Bill will at least put them in a comparable position. It provides for a 40-hour week to be worked in five days, with three hours extra on the Friday evening and Saturday morning, which we accept must be worked in this type of industry because, after all, it is a service industry. The industry, too, accepts that, but at least it wants to be recognized not as second-class workers, second-class employees or second-class people. The member for Playford clearly read out in this Chamber the rates prevailing in other industries. When we hear of the great profits derived by this industry, why should it deny the people who work for it and make the profits for their shareholders reasonable conditions of living?

Mr. Goldsworthy: What are you trying to say?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: They have to pay their rent and educate their children.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are you looking for overtime for them?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The Minister is replying to the debate and he must do so without interjection. I ask the Minister to reply to the debate and to ignore interjections.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am looking for a reasonable living for this huge section of the work force of South Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How are you going to give it to them?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This Bill will certainly give them a much better deal than they are getting today.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Closing times."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move to insert the following new paragraph: (ba) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "12.30 p.m." and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "11.30 a.m.";

This is one of a series of amendments necessary to protect the interests of the shop assistant. Members on this side have said for some time that they prefer shopping to proceed on a demand basis, but that is not the point under consideration at the moment. We are not seeking to expand the provisions of the

Bill to include shopping at all hours. If there was an arrangement for such shopping hours, the shop assistants could be fitted into an over-all roster. Some of them, naturally, would have to work beyond a certain time, perhaps 12.30 p.m., 2.30 p.m. or 3.30 p.m. However, where we are confining shopping to a certain period of time, it is in the interests of the shop assistants that their free time should not be eroded.

After Friday evening shopping was taken away from the outer areas, there was a closing time of 12.30 p.m. on Saturday. Instead of many shops that had been open on the Friday evening closing at 11.30 a.m. on the Saturday, as they had previously done, they extended their trading hours to 12 noon. I am advised by the employers that, when the shop assistants had to work until 12 noon on a Saturday, the staff morale dropped because of the late closing and its effect on Saturday afternoon sport. Also, the extra half hour had to be paid for at overtime rates and this produced administrative difficulties. Unless the amendment is carried, stores could decide in the future to remain open until 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays, and the difficulties foreseen could be magnified. Mount Gambier is the only country town where stores are open beyond 11.30 a.m.; in fact, they are currently open until 12 noon. We should tell the workers here and now what their finishing time will be. Indeed, from representations made to me and other members on this side, I know that shopkeepers desire this provision.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I am afraid that I cannot agree to the amendment. In the first place, the Bill does not deal with country areas, so I shall forgive the honourable Leader for his inexperience in not following the measure more closely. In regard to the amendment dealing with the metropolitan area, the honourable Leader knows that it is not mandatory for stores to remain open until 11.30 a.m.; in fact, it is not mandatory for them to open on Saturday mornings at all. Therefore, I do not think we should interfere with the present arrangements, and that is why we have left the closing time at 12.30.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The present position, as I understand it (and I am looking at the award, which states that the ordinary hours that must be worked are from 8.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m. on Saturdays), is that all stores close at 11.30 a.m. on Saturdays.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: So what are you worrying about?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We believe that when there is an attempt to legislate hours, as there is here, we should get them right. So far as I can see, the Government does not intend to increase the spread of hours on Saturday mornings to 12.30 p.m.: why, then, should we not bring the law into line with that practice and with the award?

Mr. McRAE: In relation to the first part of the amendment, the Minister correctly said that we are not dealing with shopping districts outside the stated area. The second amendment has much merit, although one of the problems—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Playford is referring to a second amendment, but the Committee is dealing with only one amendment.

Mr. McRAE: I am sorry, Sir.

Dr. EASTICK: The uniformity we are seeking does not disturb the situation applying in those country areas that enjoy a longer trading period. The amendment, which is the first of four similar amendments, seeks to provide uniformity, a feature which the Minister has constantly stated he desires to introduce into the legislation, and which will ultimately benefit the people for whom the Minister says he is concerned. I hope that he will reconsider his position and accept this amendment, which is so important to those people.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Dr. EASTICK: I move:

In new subsection (1a) to strike out "12.30 p.m." and insert "11.30 a.m."

This amendment is to correct a situation relating to both metropolitan and country areas. The Minister has indicated that he is not interested in any action to give effect to any changes in the country areas. However, he

may possibly be interested to provide the opportunity for alterations to give effect to changes in the metropolitan area for the same reasons that I moved the provision previously. It has been suggested that this will deny the opportunity to persons who are the only employee (that is, the owner who employees himself and nobody else) to trade for the extended period. I cannot accept that this is a valid argument. Although it may be valid in the eyes of some people, I hope that with support from members from both sides of the House we can pass the amendment.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: To give the Leader a quick answer, as I have previously pointed out, it is not mandatory for businesses to stay open after 9.30 p.m. or 10.30 p.m. and I therefore do not accept this amendment.

Mr. McRAE: I rise because I did have a short informal discussion with the Leader on this matter. While I believe that the overall suggestion has much merit, there is nevertheless the inherent difficulty in its current form. While it suits the large departmental stores down to the ground, and I am sure that both employers and employees are agreed on it, it does not solve the problem of the smaller store and I refer particularly to the hardware type that is taking advantage of the weekend hours situation.

Mr. Langley: What about used cars?

Mr. McRAE: The used car people do not enthuse me, as honourable members know, and it is more the hardware type of store that I believe has a problem. I therefore rise to reassure the Leader on the comment he has made in that there is much merit in this proposal but, in its current form, I cannot overlook the situation of the smaller dealer.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. COUMBE: Thus far we have talked about the closing times of shops, but we have not touched on the opening times. I take it that the opening times of shops which do not employ assistants will not be altered. A later clause sets out the hours during which shops may trade. I recall some years ago that certain shopkeepers in Melbourne Street, North Adelaide, gained notoriety because they started business at one minute after midnight.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is dealing with clause 4, which deals with the closing times and not the opening times. The honourable member will have the right to seek information from the Minister when clause 4 has been dealt with.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—"Ordinary hours of work."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Clause 5 contains the provision to which the Opposition objects very strongly because it believes that it is quite inappropriate to provide in the Act for what shall be the ordinary hours of work and for other matters which should properly be the responsibility of an industrial tribunal, probably the Industrial Commission, and it does not believe that these provisions should be written into the Act. I, together with other Opposition members, canvassed this matter in the second reading debate. It is now late, and I do not want to go over the whole ground again. After I spoke, I believe that the member for Playford attempted to rebut the calculations I had made and put to the House but, whether he succeeded, I do not know. I was told that he did not succeed by those who knew what he was talking about. Whether or not he succeeded, the fact that he and I were arguing about the matter shows the futility of doing it in this place. Those arguments are not appropriate in Parliament but are appropriate before an industrial tribunal, whichever the appropriate one may be.

The argument itself shows the folly of putting these matters into the Act. We know that the Government wants to do it because it is hell-bent on legislating for a 40-hour five-day week for shop assistants, even though no similar legislation exists anywhere else in Australia that I know of for any other particular section of the community. People in other callings have achieved awards in the proper way, namely, through industrial tribunals. A provision has been written into the police award, but why do we have to

write it into an Act of Parliament? I believe it is wrong to do so. There is no need for me to move any formal amendment; the Opposition opposes clause 5 in its entirety.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The member for Mitcham realizes that this is a fundamental part of the Bill. This matter has been extensively debated tonight, and Government members have had the position explained to them and are supporting this clause.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hoptgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.55 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 22, at 2 p.m.